JPRS-TAC-86-049

23 JUNE 1986

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

JPRS-TAC-86-049

23 JUNE 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: Japanese Role in SDI Violates Treaty
(D. Belskiy; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 21 May 86) 1

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

Moscow Hits Bonn's Rejection of Gorbachev 15 January Proposal
(Ye. Bovkun; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 6 Feb 86) 3

SALT/START ISSUES

Soviet Comments Assail Reagan SALT II Decision
(Various sources, various dates) 6

'Alarm' in U.S., Europe 6
Weinberger: Limits 'Undesirable' 7
Warnke Criticizes Decision 7
U.S. Submarine Launchings, by Vitaliy Ilyashenko 8
Bovin on U.S. Tridents, by Aleksandr Bovin 8
PRAVDA Cites XINHUA, AP 9
Gromyko Terms Decision 'Gaffe' 10
Bovin Scores U.S. Stance, by A. Bovin 10
Zholkver Marks U.S. Attitude, by Aleksandr Zholkver 14
Pasko Hits Reagan Decision, by Vladimir Pasko 15
U.S. Charges Refuted, by A. Mozgovoy 16
Korionov Raps U.S. 'Hawks', by Vitaliy Korionov 17
Kornilov Sees Danger, by Yuriy Kornilov 17
Ambassador to UK Comments, by Tom McMullan 19
Views Violations 20
Discussion at UN Tbilisi Conference, by Yuriy Zhukov 20

West European Opposition, by Yuriy Ulyanov 23
Administration 'Propaganda' 24

XINHUA Reports U.S.-Soviet Relations Strained by SALT II Feud
(Shi Liyia; Beijing XINHUA, 4 Jun 86) 26

Canada: NATO Foreign Ministers Discuss SALT II Issue
(Ottawa THE CITIZEN, 29, 30 May 86) 28

Lord Carrington, Clark Remarks, by Jim Robb 28
First Day Sessions, by Val Sears 29

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

Soviet Official Asserts Verification No Longer Problem
(L. Semeyko; Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 30 May 86) 31

PRAVDA Correspondent on U.S. Motives for Opposing Moratorium
(V. Gan; Moscow PRAVDA, 30 May 86) 34

Indian Prime Minister Praises Nuclear Moratorium Extension
(Vladimir Baidashin; Moscow TASS, 19 May 86) 37

USSR: U.S. Defies Public Opinion on Test Ban
(Moscow PRAVDA, 21, 31 May 86; Moscow Television Service,
23 May 86) 38

'Shameless Lies', by Yuriy Kornilov 38
'Deaf to World Opinion' 39
Protest in Nevada, by Vassiliy Kharkov 40

Senator Urges U.S. Test Ban at North Atlantic Assembly
(Albert Balebanov; Moscow TASS, 26 May 86) 42

Moscow Broadcast: Test Ban Could End Arms Race
(Pavel Kuznetsov; Moscow in English to North America,
1 Jun 86) 43

TASS: U.S. Times Test for Environmental Protection Day
(Moscow TASS, 5 Jun 86) 48

IZVESTIYA Editorial Article Assails U.S. Nuclear Testing Plans
(Moscow IZVESTIYA, 4 Jun 86) 50

Stockholm Paper Cites Soviet Aides on Nordic NFZ
(Harald Hamrin; Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER, 16 Apr 86) 54

Briefs
TASS on French Mururoa Test 56

RELATED ISSUES

USSR: European Aspect of INF, CW, SDI, NFZ, MBFR Issues (A. Vtorov, Yu. Karelov; Moscow MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN, No 5, May 86) 57

Soviet Academician Interviewed on Climatic Effects of Nuclear War (Kirill Yakovlevich Kondratyev Interview; Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA, 29 Mar 86) 66

Canada: Peace Activists Lobby Clark at NATO Conference (Ottawa THE CITIZEN 29 May 86) 70

Canada: Poll Shows Majority Rejects Military Neutrality (Ottawa THE CITIZEN, 26 May 86) 71

Canada: Labrador Natives Against Goose Bay Expansion (Val Sears; Toronto THE TORONTO STAR, 29 May 86) 72

/7310

USSR: JAPANESE ROLE IN SDI VIOLATES TREATY

PM211342 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 May 86 Second Edition p 3

[Colonel D. Belskiy article under the rubric "The Facts Expose": "Dangerous Trajectory"]

[Text] The foreign press reports that Washington is harboring plans for some kind of "regional defense initiative" aimed at creating an antimissile defense with space-based elements in the Far East. By all accounts the "regional defense initiative" has been thought up as one of the options for implementing the plans to include Japan in the U.S. "star wars" program.

Washington has been harboring these plans for a long time. For more than 3 years a special "working group on international cooperation among industrial firms in the arms sphere," which is subordinate to the deputy defense secretary for research and design work and equipment, has existed under the U.S. Defense Department scientific and technical council. During 1983-85, its experts studied questions in Japan linked with obtaining the latest technology and expanding U.S.-Japanese scientific and technical cooperation.

A year ago, the Pentagon gave Japan a list that included around 50 types of equipment and modern technology the U.S. Defense Department is interested in obtaining. This list includes apparatus for detecting missiles in flight, lasers, fiber-optic and microwave equipment, microprocessors and infrared equipment, microcircuits for computers, computers using large integrated circuits, and much more.

It should be taken into account that the involvement of Japanese business in the implementation of SDI plans has been predetermined to a certain extent by the agreement on the exchange of advanced Japanese technology to the United States. Now, Washington is hoping to hitch Japanese industry to the U.S. military-industrial complex as strongly as the industry of certain West European NATO countries. In particular, the U.S. Administration is counting on concluding an intergovernmental agreement with Japan similar to that reached with the FRG. This agreement would regulate the procedure for including Japanese firms in research on the SDI program.

Meanwhile, U.S. military-industrial companies are having some success in establishing direct links with Japanese firms with a view to joint participation in the U.S. SDI. It is worth noting that the Japanese Government, while not yet having consented to participation in the "star wars" program, is at the same time not preventing the country's corporations from conducting direct talks on concluding contracts to carry out certain projects within the SDI framework.

Japan's participation in the "star wars" program has been supported from the outset by those circles that linked with companies producing military output. It is well known, for instance, that exploratory work on the creation of ICBM's is being carried out by the Nissan (Dzidosya) company. The Mitsubishi, Nippon (Denki), Ishikawajima-Harima, and other company also occupy leading positions in the implementation of missile and space programs. Tempted by generous Pentagon promises, the leaders of military business and government officials linked with them are demanding, contrary to the people's will, that Japan participate as quickly as possible in the "star wars" program. It is this recommendation that is contained, in particular, in the report given to the country's government by a delegation of Japanese officials and representatives of industrial circles that visited the United States in April with a view to studying both the "star wars" program itself and the specific conditions for Japanese participation in its implementation.

Tokyo would like to present the "Japanese formula" for involvement in SDI as some kind of harmless "collaboration." They are claiming importunately that it is not a question merely of studying the "funamental opportunity for creating a defensive, nonnuclear, ABM system." However, the lasers and guidance systems for other missile-kill means already being created within the SDI framework -- and, incidentally, not without participation by Japanese firms -- are thought of in the Pentagon as part and parcel of space-strike arms and a component of the strategic forces intended for inflicting a nuclear first strike.

The SDI program envisages the utilization of the energy generated by a nuclear explosion as an integral element in space-strike weapons. The attempts to prove that x-ray lasers bear no relation to nuclear weapons seem naive. In this connection, THE JAPAN TIMES correctly wrote that the implementation of SDI would be suicidal for Japan. After all, the utilization of explosive nuclear devices forms the basis of the SDI technical concept.

Under a protocol signed last December, the United States is to obtain Japanese technology for the production of an optical guidance system for surface-to-air missiles ensuring a high strike rate. With slight modifications this system too could be used to create space weapons.

Japan's collaboration in the creation of U.S. space weapons does not accord with the spirit of the Nonproliferation Treaty to which it is a signatory. It would be a vilation of the Treaty on the Peaceful Use of Space, signed by Japan in 1967, and it contravenes its nonnuclear principles and the principles banning weapon exports.

In other words, Japan's participation in the creation of space-strike arms would attest to the country's rejection of its obligations and would show that its policy is on an extremely dangerous trajectory.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1391

MOSCOW HITS BONN'S REJECTION OF GORBACHEV 15 JANUARY PROPOSAL

Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Feb 86 p 5

[Report by IZVESTIYA correspondent Ye. Bovkun, Bonn: "Against the Current: In Bonn They are Attempting to Sow Distrust of the USSR's Peaceful Initiatives"]

[Text] Interest in the idea of building a nuclear-free civilization is demonstrated even in bourgeois circles in the FRG. Recently, for example, the complete text of CPSU CC General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev's Statement was published in the newspaper FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE, which reflects the opinion of large financial and industrial capital and is a supporter of the SDI.

No less symbolic was an article in the magazine STERN. "Can a communist be right?" its chief editor R. Winter asked in an editorial. He answered: "The leader in the Kremlin deserves applause. Never before in past decades has one statesman advanced such an all-embracing and radical proposal for the good of mankind." Objective assessments of the Soviet initiative can be heard from the most diverse people.

In contrast to this, official Bonn has taken a position clearly without considering either the opinion of its nation's public or the logic of detente. This position is based on the arguments of representatives of neoconservative thinking: proponents of "Star Wars" and those expressing the interests of the military-industrial complex. They are mainly politicians in the right-wing of the Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union.

Their attitude toward the USSR's new proposals was most thoroughly defined by F. Ruhe, deputy chairman of the CDU/CSU in the Bundestag. IZVESTIYA (No. 28) has already reported on a press conference arranged by him. It would apparently make sense to return to his arguments, however, since the "security policy" concept of official West German circles is presently based in great part on them. One senses a certain design in F. Ruhe's statements: to express as many general reservations as possible to avoid going deeply into the essence of the Soviet proposals.

This parliamentarian views their extensive publicizing primarily as "relying on propaganda," assuming that there will be realistic chances of achieving a compromise only if the interested parties discuss such matters confidentially in advance, in secret. But the Soviet Government came out against secret diplomacy in its Peace Decree. The USSR has never made its peace initiatives a subject of secret talks.

The Soviet proposals are clearly too general, it seems, and they need to be detailed to the maximum possible degree, the Bonn politician feels, in order then to discuss them individually. But how many specific measures advanced by the USSR for controlling the arms race has the West rejected in the past on the basis that they were "too particular"?

Take the following reservation. F. Ruhe tries to show that in order to resolve disarmament problems, it is necessary first to work to build up trust. He then turns around and demonstrates a certain distrust and suspicion. He does not believe that it would be possible in 15 years to get rid of weapons accumulated over a period of four decades and doubts Moscow's preparedness "to ensure an equal right to security for all of the states in Europe." The doubts are backed up with suggestions that the West may find itself at a "disadvantage," since, he says, there are no guarantees that Soviet tactical nuclear systems will actually be eliminated in the second phase of disarmament.

The question of trust is unquestionably a complex one. It was resolved long ago with respect to Soviet foreign policy, however. In 1922 Lenin told a British correspondent: "Our experience has produced in us the absolute conviction that only enormous attention to the interests of different nations eliminates the basis for conflicts, eliminates mutual distrust, eliminates fear of some sort of intrigues, and creates that trust... without which both peaceful relations among peoples and any sort of successful development of all that which is valuable in modern civilization are absolutely impossible."

And speaking of doubts, where is the guarantee that the USA, after creating the so-called "space shield," will not attack the USSR from space. It worked out the "Dropshot" plan, after all, and achieved a short-lived atomic monopoly. Considering the historic experience, the Soviet people have far more reasons to doubt the sincerity of intentions in Bonn, where they speak of "peace with the smallest quantity of weapons," while at the same time arming the Bundeswehr with offensive weapons, deploying Pershing and cruise missiles, and straining to take part in the oversea "Star Wars" plans.

The insuperable attraction of the military concerns for this space program, superprofits and militaristic ambitions--this is what is preventing Bonn from objectively assessing the situation. This is precisely why in Bonn they are using all possible means to demonstrate that the SDI "is better" than the Soviet proposal.

F. Ruhe lavishes praise upon Reagan's plan as the path to "objective devaluation of nuclear weapons." It is clear, however, that the ultimate goal of the "Star Wars" program is to "devalue" only the Soviet nuclear arsenals. NATO is not planning to give up its stocks, after all. FRG Defense Minister M. Worner recently underscored in the Bundestag that the total elimination of battlefield nuclear weapons in the immediate future does not conform to the interests of the North Atlantic alliance.

The leadership of the CDU/CSU has demonstrated once again that they totally share the ideas of the Washington hawks. It is as though F. Ruhe has attempted to separate the "grain" from the "weeds" in the peaceful Soviet proposals by sifting them through the screen of NATO concepts. The result was "constructive

elements" (that is, those which suit Bonn) on the one hand, and "problematic [elements]" (that is, those unacceptable to Bonn) on the other.

Just what are the Christian Democrats prepared to accept in the Soviet leader's Statement? First of all, that which can be interpreted as concessions.

Everything in conflict with the concept of achieving bilateral superiority is declared to be "problematic," however. Just what in the Soviet proposals suits Bonn the least? In the first place, the proposal that "third nations" (in this case, England and France) not build up their nuclear arsenals. It is all perfectly obvious. The FRG, which is actively developing military cooperation with its West European partners, is obviously hoping to obtain some degree of access to NATO's nuclear levers.

In the second place, F. Ruhe states that realization of the Soviet proposals would mean "consolidating the superiority" of the Warsaw Pact in conventional weapons, which, he would have it appear, are being factored out. They have apparently not carefully read the document in Bonn, however. It clearly speaks of the USSR's preparedness to have conventional weapons and armed forces also be an object of agreed-upon reductions.

The third "stumbling block," according to Ruhe, is the moratorium on nuclear explosions. This objection is understandable. After all, these tests are an element of the SDI program on which the Bonn conservatives place large stakes. And finally, the CDU/CSU leader seized the demand that implementation of the SDI be abandoned as the main obstacle to acceptance of the "Gorbachev concept," even though the danger of the "Star Wars" plans to the cause of peace and security of peoples is more than apparent.

The Federal Republic could play an important role in the process of improving the political climate in Europe. Many people here are thinking about possibilities for it to make a concrete contribution to detente.

Ruling circles in the FRG apparently do not want to listen to the voices of reason, however. Particularly since Bonn does not have its own original formulas for improving the international situation. And even the arguments against the Soviet initiatives are not distinguished by particular innovation. And where would new concepts come from, when the mode of thinking of the CDU/CSU leaders is defined by obsolete stereotypes. "The people and the politicians would not feel confident if the weapons which we have always recommended as an essential condition for greater security and stability were to suddenly disappear." This is how F. Ruhe expressed it in an interview conducted by the editors of DEUTCHLANDFUNK.

Albert Einstein spoke of the inevitability of human thinking's adaptation to the fact that nuclear weapons exist. Another revolution in the mass awareness is now objectively at hand, one requiring first of all rejection of the categories of confrontation and hostility and the resolute elimination of adventuristic, militaristic concepts. The proponents of conservative thinking in Bonn resist new ideas. This accounts for their disinclination to carefully study the essence of the Soviet proposals, which consider in equal degree the security interests of the East and the West.

11499
CSO: 5200/1314

SOVIET COMMENTS ASSAIL REAGAN SALT II DECISION

'Alarm' in U.S., Europe

PM301406 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 May 86 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Undermining SALT II"]

[Text] New York, 29 May -- President Reagan's statement on the U.S. intention to exceed the limits of SALT II later this year has met with alarm and concern among U.S. political and public figures, scientists, specialists in military affairs.and Washington's European allies.

President Reagan "has basically declared war on arms control," Edward Markey, member of the U.S. House of Representatives, said.

He terms "irresponsible" the statement by the head of the administration on plans to begin by the end of the year, in breach of SALT II, the equipping of strategic B-52 bombers with cruise missiles.

The present master of the White House, Paul Warnke, former head of the U.S. delegation at the SALT talks, noted, "wants to bury the entire process of arms control." To all appearances, he stressed, this time "the maniacs have gained the upper hand" in debates on the stand to be taken regarding SALT II.

"By stating that he will no longer make decisions proceeding from the limits established by SALT II, the President is introducing a new element into already tense Soviet-American relations," the newspaper NEWSDAY writes. "In the opinion of specialists, the President's decision places in even more doubt the chances of making serious progress at the Soviet-American arms control talks in Geneva and undermines the prospects for holding a summit meeting between the USSR and the United States this year."

At the same time U.S. militarist circles have taken Reagan's statement as meaning one thing. The United States "is no longer bound" to continue observance of SALT II, U.S. Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger told journalists. "We are no longer tied to this mistake of an agreement. It is all very simple," he proclaimed.

As AP points out in this connection, Weinberger's statements, "although to a considerable extent reiterating the statement by President Reagan, at the same time to an even greater extent attested that the decision to renounce SALT II has been quite definitely taken."

Weinberger: Limits 'Undesirable'

LD020535 Moscow TASS in English 0527 GMT 2 Jun 86

[Text] Washington June 2 TASS -- U.S. Secretary of Defence Caspar Weinberger, in an interview with the CBS TV network, has emphasized that the White House considers it undesirable to stay within the limits set by the SALT-2 treaty. He admitted that the limits prevented the United States from developing a new inter-continental ballistic missile, the Midgetman, and from continuing to build up all components of U.S. strategic forces. The U.S. secretary of defense pointed out that in certain areas, for example, the deployment of strategic bombers with cruise missiles on board, the United States would exceed the limits, stipulated by the SALT-2 treaty, in the near future.

Warnke Criticizes Decision

LD311025 Moscow TASS in English 0956 GMT 31 May 86

[Text] Washington May 31 TASS -- Delegates attending a Capitol Hill nuclear freeze campaign forum on defense and social policies demanded that President Reagan reconsider his decision to stop observing the SALT-2 treaty. They came out in favor of urgent arms limitation measures.

The renunciation of such an important document as SALT-2, said Paul Warnke, former director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, will "open floodgates for massive increases" in new nuclear arms. This will add nothing to the security of the United States, on the contrary it will leave it seriously undermined.

If the U.S. Administration goes over the Salt-2 limits the Soviet Union will invariably conclude, Warnke said, "that nuts have won" in Washington. "Nuts, I think, stands for nuclear utilization theorists, those that actually think that nuclear weapons are an instrument of military and foreign policy," he emphasized. By taking its decision administration officials "shot themselves in the foot -- they have taken very careful aim and hit the target," he said.

Warnke noted that the United States would slide over the treaty's limits by arming B-52 bombers with cruise missiles. He emphasized it was especially dangerous to go over the treaty's limits on intercontinental strategic missiles.

"I do not think," he added, "that the Soviet Union is so philanthropic as to spend money to scrap missiles" (in case the United States violates the relevant provisions of the treaty).

In the end, Paul Warnke said, the Soviet Union will increase the number of warheads on its missiles.

U.S. Submarine Launchings

OW310133 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1045 GMT 30 May 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Vitaliy Ilyashenko]

[Text] The eighth nuclear Ohio class submarine has been launched in the United States. The huge craft, named "Nevada," carries 24 Trident ballistic missiles with MIRV nuclear warheads.

The world attentively watched what Washington would do as the commissioning of a new submarine violates the limits established by the Soviet-U.S. SALT II agreement. In order to observe the treaty, the United States must dismantle two obsolete Poseidon nuclear submarines. President Reagan went ahead with this in order, as he said, to contribute to the atmosphere of mutual restraint and create favorable conditions for arms reduction talks.

We could welcome the statement. Indeed, it is difficult to conduct one set of talks and disregard past agreements, but this logic was crushed by the President himself. In the same statement he said, and I am quoting, the United States long ago planned to remove and dismantle two of the oldest Poseidon submarines. If I was convinced, said the President, that keeping them in service substantially contributed to our national security and was economical, I would not have given the order to dismantle them.

So, the matter is not at all about Reagan's adherence to SALT II but is about the very high cost of repairing and modernizing obsolete Poseidon submarines.

Washington hawks were not pleased with the President's decision. The Pentagon chief, Weinberger, hastened to calm them. Speaking at a NATO session in Canada, he directly said that the United States intends to violate Salt II. In November, the Pentagon will begin deploying cruise missiles aboard 130 B-52 bombers, and then the United States will exceed the treaty limits. Caspar Weinberger told journalists: We are not longer bound by this flawed treaty. Everything is very simple.

Naturally, U.S. militaristic circles saw both the President's and the defense secretary's statements in the same light insofar as they coincided with their desire to open the gates for the most powerful arms race. The United States no longer remembers President Carter's words.

Carter said that SALT II was the most important step among those ever made for controlling nuclear arms. The current occupant of the White House, noted Paul Warnke, former head of the U.S. delegation to the SALT II talks, wants to bury the entire process of arms control. Judging from everything, he said, this time the maniacs have gotten the upper hand in the debate on the issue of respecting SALT II.

Bovin on U.S. Tridents

LD011840 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 1 Jun 86

[From the "International Panorama" program, presented by Aleksandr Bovin]

[Text] You know, of course, that the United States did not ratify SALT II, and correspondingly, it did not come into force. Nevertheless, both the Soviet Union and the United States were adhering to the limitations envisaged in this treaty. That is, if

some new strategic armaments were introduced, that involved dismantling of certain quantities of old weapons, so to speak. Well, SALT II has a number of provisions, one of which prohibits each side from having more than 1200 MIRVed ballistic missiles. Until recently, the Americans had had 1,198 of such missiles.

Last Wednesday they started running trials of the Ohio-type submarines, each carrying 24 Trident missiles. That results in exceeding the limit by 22 units. The President has announced that two old Poseidon submarines will be dismantled, and one would think that everything is all right here arithmetically.

But no, -- the fact is, the White House declared that the decision on scrapping the old submarines was a purely political and not economic decision, because it would be quite complicated to modernize the old submarines, and they have concluded their service period anyway.

And the United States -- the White House -- has stated that it no longer deems itself bound by the limits of SALT II and it has been said specifically that when they start deploying additional B-52 bombers equipped with nuclear cruise missiles by the end of the year, they will not reckon with any limits specified in the treaty.

At the same time, Washington is referring to violations of the treaty by the Soviet Union, but these references are absolutely false: We are not and have not been overstepping the limits of the figures specified in the treaty.

The decision made by the White House practically cancels the last limitations that had been curbing the arms race in this way or another, and here is what U.S. Senator Edward Markey said on the subject: The government -- meaning his own government -- has declared a war on weapons control.

You are all, I presume, acquainted with the statement of the Soviet Government in this connection, and I would quote a small, essential paragraph from this statement: Therefore, what the Soviet Union was warning about has occurred -- the U.S. Administration, out of all possible variants of its conduct in respect to treaties and accords that limit strategic armaments, has adopted exactly the one that undermines the foundation of the process of limiting and reducing such weapons.

Well, it is not coincidental that even U.S. NATO allies became alarmed.

PRAVDA Cites XINHUA, AP

PM051541 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jun 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS article: "Urgent Warning, World Press on USSR Government Statement"]

[Excerpts] The Soviet Union's statement in connection with the virtual U.S. refusal to observe in future the Soviet-U.S. legal treaty documents on strategic offensive arms control -- the interim 1972 agreement and the 1979 SALT II treaty -- has attracted great attention worldwide.

The Soviet Government has stated that as soon as the United States exceeds the arms levels laid down by SALT II the Soviet Union will consider itself relieved of its corresponding obligations and will take the necessary practical measures to prevent the undermining of military-strategic parity, XINHUA stresses in a commentary. The

newspaper RENMIN RIBAO describes the U.S. Government's decision to start deploying new arms, including bombers equipped with cruise missiles, at the end of this year as "an important revision of U.S. policy" and a "step that attests that the United States will no longer observe the provisions of the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty." "This decision of Reagan's," the newspaper notes, "has disappointed both the members of the U.S. Government and Congressmen advocating the establishment of arms control." In their opinion, the newspaper writes, President Reagan's decision "could put the arms race out of control."

United States

The White House has not yet given an official reply to the Soviet Government statement. The ASSOCIATED PRESS reports that in a talk with journalists White House spokesman E. Djerejian touched on the question of the Soviet Government statement. Rejecting the conclusions contained in the Soviet statement without adducing any proof, he again tried to pin the blame on others by claiming that President Reagan had allegedly "traveled his part of the way to meet the USSR over the last 4 years."

At the same time sober-minded Americans are assessing the Reagan administration's intention to abandon observance of the Soviet-U.S. SALT II treaty as an attempt to pave the way for an unbridled buildup in nuclear arsenals.

Gromyko Terms Decision 'Gaffe'

AU030802 Paris AFP in English 0753 GMT 3 Jun 86

[Excerpts] Moscow, June 3 (AFP) - Soviet President Andrey Gromyko sees Washington's decision to stop automatically respecting all its 1979 SALT-2 treaty with Moscow as a major gaffe, British MP Martin Flanery said after a Kremlin visit.

Mr. Gromyko, the former long-serving foreign minister, added that Soviet leaders did not believe U.S. opinion really agreed the treaty should be broken up, Mr. Flanery (Labour), here with a British all-party delegation, added.

Mr. Gromyko's comments, as reported by Mr. Flanery, were not included in a long official report of the Kremlin meeting, carried by the media Tuesday.

The British delegation met Mr. Gromyko for two-and-a-half hours here Monday, after talks with Soviet party chief Mikhail Gorbachev last week.

Bovin Scores U.S. Stance

PM021403 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Jun 86 Morning Edition p 5

[A. Bovin "Political Observer's Opinion": "Gulf"]

[Text] From time to time it is useful to examine old papers or books read long ago. As a rule, something interesting and needed in the present can always be derived from them. So permit me to quote: "Human reason is incomplete, hence the inevitable divergence between the world as it is and our image of it. As long as our image is close to objective reality we are able to solve our problems in a sensible and appropriate manner. But when our image fails to tally with events, when we refuse to

believe what we do not like, what scares us, or simply what we find entirely unfamiliar, the discrepancy between the facts and our image of them turns into an insuperable gulf and our actions become foolish and inappropriate." Those words were spoken more than 20 years ago, on 25 March 1964, to be exact. They were spoken in the U.S. Senate by James W. Fulbright, the well-known politician.

Much has changed since then. There was a time when the American image of the world "as it is" approximated to objective reality. Although that time was short-lived, it left us, in particular, the SALT I and II agreements and the ABM Treaty -- documents that have proved the fundamental possibility of reaching agreement on the most important and delicate of political questions.

But, I repeat, that time was short-lived. In the second half of the seventies the discrepancy between fact and image started growing and, after the appearance of the current President in the White House, turned into an "insuperable gulf." If Washington is the beloved city of the "Almighty" then the "Devil" is undoubtedly Moscow. Everything not to the Reagan administration's liking, everything that scared it and that it did not understand has been ascribed to machinations and intrigues and seen as the "reds'" ineradicable desire to take over the entire world.

Last week a TV talk was organized between the U.S. President and American students. The naive students asked the President: "If the United States and Russia have created enough arms to completely wipe each other out why are we still spending colossal sums on building up our defense potential?" The President replied: "We are forced to believe that the Soviet Union is pursuing an expansionist policy."

"It holds the conviction that its aim must be to develop world revolution until a world communist state is formed." The President needs such a willful interpretation of Soviet foreign policy aims and the substitution of historical philosophy with a kind of historical mythology in order to substantiate and justify the striking difference between words and deeds. The words are about the usefulness of disarmament and the desire for disarmament. The deeds however, are to build up arms and block disarmament talks.

In complete violation of logic and the objective trends of military rivalry it is claimed in Washington that only by transferring "defense efforts" to space, that is -- to call a spade a spade -- by militarizing space, can the conditions for disarmament be created on earth. The "star wars" program is now a symbol of U.S. militarism, which is already short of room on earth, at sea, and in the air...

Some $3.05 billion were allocated for research within the SDI framework in fiscal 1986. In fiscal 1987, the administration is asking for this sum to be increased by 77 percent. However, the launch of billion-dollar sums into space is starting to embarrass many Americans. The other day 46 senators (37 Democrats and 9 Republicans) protested the star wastefulness and demanded that the growth of SDI appropriations be increased by only 3 percent. The administration recoiled. The squabbling continues.

The arguments about the military potential of space are being accompanied by the active "modernization" of what already exists on earth. This is exacerbating again and again the question of the observance of the limitations imposed by the interim SALT I agreement and the SALT II agreement. This is not a trivial situation. SALT I has long since expired. But SALT II has not come into force at all, because the Americans refused to ratify it. Nonetheless, up until now both sides in principle took into account the provisions of these documents. Thus, in order not to overstep the limits contained in them, the USSR dismantled 540 strategic delivery vehicle units when siting new arms and the United States dismantled 168 such vehicles.

This week the Pentagon noted that start of sea trials of the eighth Trident-class submarine. It contains 24 MIRVed ballistic missiles. This will mean that the limit for strategic delivery vehicles laid down by SALT II will have been surpassed. In order to prevent this it is necessary to dismantle two old Poseidon submarines. And this decision was made.

However, this was by no means done out of a partiality for arms limitation, rather for purely economic reasons. For strategic bombers are being equipped with nuclear-armed cruise missiles at the same time. "Since production of the new long-range B-1 bomber and the B-52 modernization program are in full swing," the West German magazine DER SPIEGEL wrote recently, "the opponents of SALT II believe that the dismantling of both Poseidon submarines is not such a tragic event, even the contrary. For them the dismantling decision is rather a sign that Reagan ... intends to tear up the arms agreement no later than next December." That is what has happened. It has been announced that by year's end, the United States intends to exceed the limits set by SALT II. To exceed them, needless to say, in order to strengthen U.S. security and weaken Soviet security. That pathetic calculation is yet further evidence that the images of U.S. politicians, to recall Fulbright's argument, "do not tally with the development of events" and fail to take into account the specifics of the nuclear age and the stability and steadiness of military-strategic parity.

A clear-cut political assessment of what has happened was given in the recent Soviet Government statement. "Thus, what the Soviet Union was warning aginst has happened. Of all the options for possible action regarding the treaties and agreements limiting strategic arms the U.S. Administration has chosen precisely the one that undermines the foundations of the process for limiting and reducing such arms. Faced with the choice of moderating its own arms programs or opening the floodgates for an uncontrolled arms race, Washington has preferred the latter."

Stating that the United States will no longer take into account the restrictions stemming from SALT II, the U.S. President is consciously and deliberately moving affairs toward a deterioration in Soviet-U.S. relations and the intensification of international tension. This has triggered a veritable rumpus in NATO. At the organization's council session the U.S. allies criticized the White House decision in one way or another. Shultz, the U.S. newspapers wrote, was isolated. But the latest token resistance will hardly influence Washington.

The "senselessness and inappropriateness" of U.S. policy is seen in the pursuit not only of nuclear but also chemical superiority. The Pentagon insisted that the production of new-generation combat toxins (binary weapons) be launched. Congress hesitated. In the end the following decision was made: The funds for the production of binary weapons would only be allocated if the NATO allies agreed.

The action moved from Washington to Brussels. The Americans went all out. They argued that chemical weapons would be produced and stockpiled in the United States; only in the event of crisis situations would they be transferred to Western Europe. Ultimately the NATO Military Planning Committee approved the U.S. plan last Thursday. At the same time Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands, Greece, Iceland, and Luxembourg stated that they would not permit chemical weapons to be sited on their territories. The FRG and Britain are reckoned to be the first candidates for the siting. K. Voigt, the prominent Social Democratic Party figure, called 22 May a "black day" for disarmament in Europe.

On the whole, armed forces are being built up in all directions. The conceptual basis of this policy is as old as the world, or rather, as the world of traditions continued by today's Washington -- the use of force to settle political disputes. That force is used wherever Washington can count on overwhelming military superiority. Libya is the latest example.

The Americans presented the attack on the "den of terrorism" and the bombing of Tripoli and Banghazi as a model of a policy illuminated by lofty moral principles. What kind of morality this is was indicated by South Africa, which organized armed raids against Zambia, Botswana, and Zimbabwe. Recalling the Israeli strike against PLO headquarters in Tunis and the U.S. strike against Libya, South African President P. Botha stated: "Like the United States and all other civilized governments, we reject organized terrorism on a world scale. Equally, we will not tolerate terrorists hiding in other countries with the intention of carrying out crimes against our country's people." When the White House incumbent did not accept the kiss from his South African colleague and when Washington explained that what is permitted Jupiter is not permitted Botha, Pretoria was indignant: "South Africa," the South African president said, "will not allow double standards and hypocrisy from the West, even in respect of legal principles, to stand in the way of our obligation to defend our country." He added: "South Africa will unhesitatingly take such actions in the future." A bad example is indeed catching.

Hypnotizing itself with its almighty power and the seeming impunity of its use, Washington does not want to realize that power that is not endowed with reason and fails to take the general trend of sociopolitical changes into account, inevitably leads to an overall deterioration in the international situation. Washington may suppose that the complication of Soviet-U.S. relations continually provoked by U.S. show of force strengthens U.S. foreign policy positions and makes U.S. security more stable. If that is so the gulf between the actual state of affairs and the current administration's impression of it really is insuperable.

In an attempt to reassure public opinion and create the impression that the strong-arm policy of the White House is not causing a deterioration in Soviet-U.S. relations, officials in Washington are referring to the meetings of Soviet and American experts on the problems of chemical weapons, on risk reduction centers [po tsentram shizheniya riska], andon the situation in southern Africa and Central America.

They recall that similar meetings are being prepared on the Near East and East Asia. This is all true. These meetings have been held and, clearly, will continue to be. But it is not hard to realize that the future of Soviet-U.S. relations does not hinge on consultations concerning individual, albeit very important, questions of world policy. The future of Soviet-U.S. relations depends on the state of affairs in the central part of world policy -- I am thinking of the arms race and the reduction of military potentials, first and foremost nuclear potentials. By not realizing this, or pretending that it does not realize it, and by not attempting to overcome the gulf between reality and myth and between the objective demands of the age and its own prejudices, illusions, and bias, the U.S. Administration is eliminating the hopes that arose after Geneva.

Zholkver Marks U.S. Attitude

LD022222 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1443 GMT 2 Jun 86

[From "The World Today" presented by Aleksandr Zholkver]

[Text] Hello comrades! The Soviet Government statement regarding the U.S. refusal to continue to adhere to the Soviet-U.S. agreements on limiting strategic armaments is the center of attention of international observers today.

In Vienna, in June 1979, I had a chance to witness the signing of the second Soviet-U.S. treaty on limiting strategic arms at the Soviet-U.S. summit. Although it was unfortunately never ratified by the United States -- because of resistance by the U.S. military-industrial complex -- both sides still adhered to its tenets, and this served as an essential barrier to an arms race. And now, President Reagan has announced the refusal of the United States to adhere either to the 1972 agreement or SALT II.

Paul Warnke, one of the veterans of U.S. diplomacy, who in his time headed the U.S. delegation to the Soviet-U.S. talks on SALT II, called this action by the Washington administration a mad policy. Noting the fact that the bureaucrats who came to the White House under Reagan have never been advocates of arms control, Warnke arrived at a grim conclusion: At this stage, madmen have won.

Nevertheless, this madness has its own logic, the logic of the military-industrial complex. Its plans are rendered in detail in the U.S. report on arms control and disarmament that has just been sent by the President to the Congress. I would like to make it clear from the start that, contrary to the official name of the agency, the report does not deal with arms control at all, and is even further from dealing with disarmament; on the contrary, it deals with a massive buildup of armaments by the United States. Here is but a brief list of some basic military programs contained in this report: another 50 ICBM's, in addition to the 50 already planned; development of another, the 14th, nuclear submarine of the Trident class; and, as the report goes, the full-scale development and manufacturing of 100 strategic bombers -- the B-18. A special section of the report is devoted to the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative; in other words, putting into space various types of weapons -- kinetic, beam, and even nuclear ones. The report does not make any bones about the fact that nuclear tests provide an opportunity to update nuclear armaments. Such are the basic features of Washington's arms race program.

It is hardly surprising then that the Pentagon's boss, Weinberger, bluntly speaks about the undesirability of adhering to the limitations established by SALT II. A curious nuance: Weinberger has just created a special post in the Pentagon, a supervisor of the program for purchasing armaments, with the rank of a deputy secretary.

What is even more revealing, Richard Godwin, an old friend of Weinberger and vice president of the Bechtel Corporation, one of the largest companies in California, has been appointed to this post. I can only add that Weinberger was vice chairman of the same firm prior to ascending to the post of the Pentagon's boss in 1981. So now, the direct path from the Pentagon's leadership to the leading U.S. monopolies will be even shorter.

Pasko Hits Reagan Decision

LD072155 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 2 Jun 86

[Vladimir Pasko commentary from the "International Diary" program presented by Vladimir Fadeyev]

[Text] It is said that when the U.S. President announced his intention concerning SALT II at a meeting in Tokyo of the leaders of the major capitalist countries, UK Prime Minister Thatcher, resolutely, though without excessive fuss, expressed her protest to Reagan. The same was done by other participants at the meeting. The President promised to take their opinion into consideration. It is known now how that was done. The U.S. abandonment of SALT II is planned for the end of the year when, in the process of deploying new arms, particularly heavy bombers with cruise missiles, the United States oversteps the limits established in the treaty at 1,320 units for strategic MIRV's. The President bluntly stated that the United States will not dismantle the appropriate quantity of armaments to prevent it from exceeding that level.

The President's reaction to the Soviet Government statement was to be expected: SALT II has come to limit the arms race, has set limits on certain nuclear weapons systems, and has narrowed the sphere of their proliferation. Observing its provisions on a mutual basis would continue to be very significant for maintaining the strategic balance and for ensuring conducive conditions for elaborating new accords on limiting and cutting back on arms.

As a member of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, Markey stated: By his decision, the President has essentially declared war on arms control. The former leaders of the U.S. delegation at the SALT talks, Smith and Warnke, and former Defense Secretary McNamara have expressed the same reservations. Delight in the White White House chief's decision could be heard only in the camp of militarists. We are no longer tied to this flawed document, the Pentagon boss stated after the President's speech.

For those who make a living out of military business, the SALT agreement has become an obstacle to new profits. Describing the struggle in Congress surrounding SALT, THE WASHINGTON POST wrote on the day of Reagan's statement: When the decision is made at the end of the year on this treaty, it will be a matter of the whole system of nuclear forces. The Pentagon intends to make a decision on the production of the mobile ICBM, the Midgetman, which has several warheads; Weinberger also announced that the Air Force intends to modify all its B-52 aircraft to carry cruise missiles. Bombers, cruise missiles, Midgetmen, MX's, space-strike weapons in the framework of the notorious star wars program -- they are pressing [oni pressinguyut] across the whole spectrum.

The newspaper quotes the words of a high-ranking congressional official who, as it notes, is inclined to support SALT: What is happening now in Washington reveals once again and quite obviously the essence of the current U.S. policy, a policy for a world arms race, militarization, and the winding up international tension. In its decision to refuse to observe further the accords with the Soviet Union, the U.S. leadership is taking a dangerous step.

Our country, as the Soviet Government states, will not look on detached as the United States smashes up the agreements achieved in the field of strategic offensive arms limitation. The U.S. side must have no illusions that it will manage to achieve military advantages for itself at the expense of others' security. The Soviet Union will continue to take all measures for reliably ensuring the security of the socialist commonwealth and will continue to do everything needed to strengthen international security.

U.S. Charges Refuted

PM051316 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 3 Jun 86 First Edition p 3

[Article by A. Mozgovoy: "Contrary to Common Sense: Washington's Logic"]

[Excerpt] In order to justify their virtual refusal to observe in the future the Soviet-American treaties on strategic offensive arms limitation (SALT I and SALT II), representatives of the American Administration are accusing the Soviet Union of violating agreements, without adducing any proof. It is being claimed, in particular, that the USSR has allegedly developed and immediately deployed two new types of ICBMs, which is prohibited by SALT II.

But this is deception! Washington is passing off as the second "new type" the Soviet RS-12M missile (SS-25 in NATO terminology), which is only a modernized version of the old RS-12 missile. In terms of its weight characteristics, dimensions, number of stages, and of fuel type, that is, all the conditions stipulated by SALT II, the RS-12M missile is quite within the modernization limits stipulated by the treaty. This is also acknowledged by authoritative American strategic arms specialists. Thus, Jack Mendelsohn, a member of the U.S. delegation at the SALT talks, writes that "modifications to existing missiles are permitted as long as they do not go beyond the bounds of the limitations."

The same Mendelsohn also points out another absurdity in the accusations against the USSR which relate to the encryption of telemetric information in missile tests. "SALT II directly permits the encryption of telemetry," the American expert stresses, "and prohibits it only when it impedes monitoring of the observance of treaty obligations." The Soviet Union does not encipher parameters bearing on the monitoring of fulfillment of the SALT II provisions. What is more, we have more than once proposed to U.S. representatives that they name the parameters which, in their opinion, should not be coded. But a refusal was the response, because this question is supposedly "too secret for discussion."

Other such "accusations" addressed to us also fail to stand up to criticism. They are simply not based on facts. Not without reason American General Richard Ellis said recently at hearings in the U.S. Congress House of Representatives Intelligence Committee that the Soviet Union conscientiously observes its treaty obligations. This cannot be said of the United States itself. Washington long ago embarked on a path of gradually worming its way out of SALT II. Contrary to Article XII of the greaty, which prohibits circumvention of the treaty in any manner, the deployment of medium-range nuclear missiles has begun in Western Europe -- these missiles being strategic means in relation to USSR territory. The United States has organized the production and mass deployment of long-range cruise missiles. American military and industrial corporations are creating a new ICBM -- the "Midgetman" -- which is really the second since the MX [as published]. The United States is constantly violating the clause on not using deliberate camouflage which complicates monitoring. And now it is planning to break the treaty system altogether.

Korionov Raps U.S. 'Hawks'

PM031425 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Jun 86 First Edition p 5

[Vitaliy Korionov "Commentator's Column": "The Wreckers"]

[Text] In Western Europe, Asia and other parts of the world, and in the United States itself there is mounting condemnation of the White House decision announced a few days ago about the de facto refusal of the United States to continue to abide by Soviet-American agreements of paramount importance for strategic offensive arms limitation -- the 1972 Interim Agreement [SALT I] and the 1979 SALT II agreement.

Under a barrage of sharp criticism, the administration's spokesmen are claiming that the U.S. Administration "has traveled one more mile" in the sphere of arms control. True, the administration has traveled another mile, however, in the wrong direction, in the direction of wrecking the very foundation of the process of limiting and reducing nuclear arsenals.

The President, Congressman E. Markey noted, "has effectively declared war on arms control." Senator A. Gore added: "Arms control is hanging by a thread." The head of the White House, the British FINANCIAL TIMES writes, "is definitively undermining the foundations of one of the main curbs on the arms race." Western observers are almost unanimous in their assessment that the "hawks" who have long been trying to wreck the Soviet-American agreements that to a certain extent restrain the most dangerous type of arms race have gained the upper hand in Washington.

While certain administration officials are trying to assure people that the United States will finally withdraw from SALT II only in, say, fall or toward the end of the year. Secretary of Defense C. Weinberger is saying that the United States "is no longer bound" by SALT II.

However, it is not only a question of the fate of the aforementioned document. The "hawks'" plan go much further than that. They regard the abandonment of SALT II as a major step toward wrecking everything positive that has been achieved with great difficulty in the cause of normalizing Soviet-American relations in past years. Some far-sighted people in the United States are warning that the administration has set its sights not only on SALT II but also the 1972 ABM Treaty.

These are all dangerous symptoms. Essentially it is a question of attempts to poison the general atmosphere in Soviet-American relations to such an extent as to render the continuation of the Soviet-American dialogue at the summit level impossible.

The forces that seek to preserve peace and curb the arms race cannot but draw the appropriate conclusions from the actions of the Washington administration.

Kornilov Sees Danger

LD031428 Moscow TASS in English 1357 GMT 3 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow June 3 TASS -- TASS Political News Analyst Yuriy Kornilov writes:

President Reagan's decision to break out of the SALT-2 treaty is the most serious blunder made over the entire period of his stay in the White House. This has been stated by Senator Edward Kennedy, a prominent U.S. public figure, in a speech in the

Senate. Mr Kennedy's statement is consonant with pronouncements by many other sober-minded political figures of the West, and with the opinions of prominent scientists, authoritative military experts, and members of the public at large of various countries, including that of the USA. And there can be no other estimate of Washington's actions.

What is in actual fact the essence of the U.S. President's recent statement on a virtual refusal to be bound by the SALT agreements in the future? The essence is that the strategic offensive arms' ceilings set by the agreements no longer suit those U.S. circles which count on force, and steer matters towards a further build-up of U.S. military might. Washington seeks to remove the 'hindrances'. Such is the 'logic' of militarist policy.

The U.S. President's decision signifies that the U.S. leadership has gone to an exceptionally dangerous measure in the cause of destroying the treaty system which restrains the nuclear arms race and thereby brings about conditions for the conclusion of new agreements. The U.S. decision signifies that the U.S. Administration is openly proclaiming a course towards full implementation of a nuclear arms build-up programme adopted by it.

Commenting on Washington's militarist action, many observers and press media emphasise that it fully fits into the framework of the U.S. global foreign policy. And this is really so. In December 1984 U.S. President Ronald Reagan declared on the pages of a New York monthly, "AMERICAN PIGEON MAGAZINE," that nuclear war was unwinnable and it should not be started. Such were the words but what is the real policy of Washington and what is its reply to the Soviet peace initiatives? In response to the call for preventing a transfer of the arms race to outer space, and for turning the near-earth space into an arena of peaceful and mutually beneficial scientific cooperation, Washington replied with a speeded-up preparation for 'star wars'. In response to the proposal to ban nuclear weapon testing, Washington replied with new nuclear tests in Nevada. In response to the calls for a ban on barbarous chemical weapons, Washington replied with sanctioning the production of a new-generation of chemical weapon -- the binary round.

The purpose of those actions is the same: At all costs, by all means to upset the established military-strategic parity in the world for the purpose of dictating U.S. will to sovereign countries and peoples upon getting a nuclear space sword, the longer and sharper the better. The leader of U.S. Communists, Gus Hall, points out that the country has never had an administration which would so actively pursue an aggressive imperialist policy as the present one.

Of course, the Soviet Union cannot and will not watch indifferently how the United States feverishly replenishes its already packed-to-capacity military arsenals with new and new types and systems of destructive weapons, and upsets the reached agreements and accords. Our country has always found -- and undoubtedly will continue to find -- an effective reply to any challenge on the part of those who would like to test once again our military and technological capabilities.

But the line towards competing against each other in the production of tools of destruction and death, pushing the world closer and closer to the abyss of a nuclear conflagration is not our choice. That line runs counter to common sense and gives rise to mounting counteraction by all peace-loving countries and all peoples that are aware of the stern realities of the nuclear age. The world has become too small and too brittle for wars and any kind of 'stratagems of power politics'. The people unanimously demand that the militarists be stopped, and that a turn to real steps to curb the arms race be secured.

Ambassador to UK Comments

LD031338 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1255 GMT 3 Jun 86

[By Tom McMullan, PA political staff]

[Text] The Soviet ambassador, Mr Leonid Zamyatin, in London today repeated before British television cameras and journalists Soviet anger at President Reagan's threat to break the SALT 2 agreement which limits the strategic nuclear weapons held by the two superpowers.

He renewed the Soviet appeal to Britain to use her influence with the U.S. to prevent President Reagan going ahead with his threat by the end of the year. New political thinking was needed, he said.

Observers noted that, despite the expressions of anger, the ambassador did not rule out a summit between President Reagan and Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev and listed subjects on which there might be scope for agreement.

Mr Zamyatin said at a press conference that Britain and the Soviet Union had "a very good experience of cooperation." He recalled the trilateral talks between 1977 and 1980 on the ban on nuclear tests when a number of agreements were signed.

He said: "The situation in the world is so complicated and tense it requires new political approaches, new political thinking and new efforts in order to curb the arms race. We think that Great Britain has its own point of view on many international issues and problems."

Britain was probably aware to a greater extent than any other country of the U.S. position on major international issues. Cooperation by the British would be very much appreciated by the international community, "whether this helped to achieve compliance with existing treaties on arms control or curbed the arms race."

The ambassador said he had discussed yesterday with Foreign Secretary Sir Geoffrey Howe the possible visit to London of Soviet Foreign Minister Mr Eduard Shevardnadze. They had not fixed a date, but talked of a visit in the middle or end of July.

He denied the Soviet Union had breached the provisions of the SALT 2 agreement. If the Americans breached the agreement, the Soviet Union would consider herself free from obligations and would not allow the undermining of military strategic parity. "The USSR will provide reliable security to socialist states," he said.

At any summit between Mr Gorbachev and President Reagan there should be measures which would strengthen international security and lead to a curb on the arms race. The ambassador indicated that a summit need not be confined only to nuclear issues. He said: "We would put forward major proposals concerning the reduction of conventional weapons and forces in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals.

"These proposals would be detailed and comprehensive. If we could agree on these questions, that would be a very good beginning for the summit.

"We do not see the second summit with the U.S. President as a forum where we can agree on all the problems.

"There is a possibility of agreeing on a ban on nuclear tests. We can agree on chemical weapons. We can agree on confidence-building measures. We can easily agree on the question of intermediate nuclear missiles."

Views Violations

LD031925 Moscow TASS in English 1800 GMT 3 Jun 86

[Text] London June 3 TASS -- A briefing for representatives of the British mass media was held at the Soviet Embassy here. The attention of journalists was drawn to the May 31 Soviet Government statement in connection with the actual refusal of the United States to abide in future by the Soviet-American treaty documents on the limitation of strategic offensive arms.

When questions were answered at the briefing it was stressed that this step by Washington unambiguously characterises the American foreign policy as being directed at further intensifying the arms race, militarising outer space and aggravating international tension. The present American leadership has taken an exceptionally dangerous measure in the direction of destroying the treaty system that restricts the nuclear arms race and thereby creates conditions for concluding new accords. The attempts of the United States to justify this course by references to some "violations" of existing agreements by the Soviet Union were refuted as totally groundless at the briefing. The Soviet side proceeds from the premise that a continued observance on a mutual basis of the commitments stipulated by the agreements would be of substantial importance for maintaining the strategic balance and strengthening security.

It was stressed at the same time that the Soviet Government will not watch impassively as the United States wrecks the system of agreements reached in the field of limiting strategic offensive arms. The American side will not succeed in achieving military advantages for itself at the expense of others.

It was noted at the briefing that Britain -- and the Soviet Union has accumulated good experience of cooperation with it, in particular at the tripartite talks on prohibiting nuclear tests -- could play an important role in efforts directed at curbing the arms race.

Discussion at UN Tbilisi Conference

PM041426 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Jun 86 First Edition p 4

[Political Observer Yuriy Zhukov article: "Wreckers" -- Uppercase paragraphs printed in boldface]

[Text] ALARM ALL OVER THE WORLD HAS BEEN INTENSIFIED BY THE U.S. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE INTENTION TO ABANDON BY THE END OF THIS YEAR SOME OF THE MOST IMPORTANT AGREEMENTS WHICH, FOR MANY YEARS ON END, ENSURED THE OBSERVANCE OF THE PRINCIPLE OF EQUALITY AND EQUAL SECURITY WHICH WAS ACCEPTED BY THE SOVIET UNION AND THE UNITED STATES IN MAY 1972.

IT IS WELL KNOWN THAT, AT THE MEETING IN THE CANADIAN CITY OF HALIFAX, EVEN THE NATO ALLIES DECLARED FOR EVERYONE TO HEAR THEIR DISAGREEMENT WITH THIS DECISION, WHICH MARKS A NEW AND DANGEROUS ZIGZAG IN U.S. POLICY FRAUGHT WITH UNPREDICTABLE CONSEQUENCES. NOW EVERYONE CAN SEE THAT THE UPPER HAND IN WASHINGTON HAS BEEN GAINED BY THE MOST REACTIONARY CIRCLES, WHICH HAVE DECIDED TO WRECK THE ENTIRE SYSTEM OF TREATIES AIMED AT ENSURING ARMS CONTROL.

Literally just a few days before the U.S. President's sensational statement, I had an opportunity to unintentionally witness the striking disregard for the world public's opinion with which these professional political wreckers commit their truly criminal deeds.

This happened in Tbilisi, where a regional UN conference on disarmament problems, the 12th so far, was being held.

Naturally, the participants in the conference showed the greatest interest in the stance of the two greatest powers in the world -- the USSR and the United States. The Soviet viewpoint was outlined by the secretary general of the USSR Foreign Ministry, but a strange hitch suddenly developed regarding the U.S. viewpoint: The U.S. Government had promised the UN Secretariat that it would send the deputy director of Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to Tbilisi, but he canceled his plans at the last moment.

This fact alone was sufficient to put the conference's participants on their guard, and caused a certain degree of alarm among them. This alarm intensified on the 2d day, when official reports reached Tbilisi that the U.S. Administration had refused to take part in another important UN conference due to be held in Paris. That was the "Disarmament and Development" conference.

How is one to explain this flagrant and, I would say, provocative behavior by the Washington leadership which, disregarding the UN initiatives, stubbornly boycotts, one after the other, the UN forums devoted to disarmament problems? Much was said on this subject in the Tbilisi conference lobbies. The majority of participants agreed that people in Washington have evidently drawn the conclusion that the growing worldwide popularity of Soviet peace initiatives, which are stubbornly rejected by the U.S. Government, makes it politically disadvantageous and even dangerous for Washington to attend any events in the course of which disarmament problems are to be discussed — after all, the U.S. spokesmen have nothing to say in justification of their negative stance!

Even if anyone still had any doubts on this account, they were dispelled on the last day of the conference when British Prof B. Buzan, one of the few participants in the debates who undertook the unenviable role of defending the U.S. stance in the absence of U.S. Government spokesmen, suddenly made the following program declaration:

"Disarmament," he said, "is a pipe dream [neeffektivnyy zamysel]. It is impracticable, and for the public this subject is unattractive -- it is too complex. There must be no confusion between goals and the means to attain them. A mistake was made when the World Disarmament Campaign was launched. It is necessary to pose not the question of disarmament, but a much broader concept -- the ensuring of security, which requires weapons. Security must be built on the basis of the idea of nonaggressive defense..."

This advocate of the opponents of disarmament was immediately backed by J. Simon, spokesman for the U.S. "National Defense College."

Both defenders of the U.S. stance were rebuffed decisively and right away.

"Your concept," Indian Ambassador M. Rasgotra declared, "is unlawful and erroneous. Disarmament is of vital importance for us. The people must force governments to embark on disarmament. As far as my country is concerned, the public and the government are unanimous on this issue: All Indians are against the arms race."

In this way, the Tbilisi conference demonstrated perfectly clearly the political will of the governments and peoples playing an active part in the World Disarmament Campaign organized by the United Nations for the achievement of agreements to end the absurd and dangerous arms race. But Washington considers it far from expedient to take into account either the opinion of the overwhelming majority of states on our planet or world public opinion. In the past few days, people there were already poring over the compilation of texts for statements by U.S. leaders and documents proclaiming determination to break all arms limitation agreements.

The U.S. President was the first to announce this intention. In his extensive statement published on 27 May, he announced that Washington intends, as early as the end of this year, to exceed the nuclear arms limits set by SALT II and that the United States will not be bound by the norms laid down in the treaty.

This unprecedented statement was backed by a whole series of statements by lower-ranking Washington figures. On the very next day, 28 May, the notorious Jeane Kirkpatrick who claims the role of the present administration's spiritual mentor, in an article published by THE WASHINGTON POST, assailed American "liberals" who demand the observance of agreements with the USSR signed by the current U.S. President's predecessors. She called for all previous arms limitation agreements to be disregarded, and for an end to be put to attempts to conclude new ones because, you see, "it is impossible to reach an accord on the observance of agreements."

On the very same day, another Washington "hawk" -- Defense Secretary C. Weinberger -- categorically declared in a speech at the West Point Military Academy that the United States will no longer honor SALT II which he maliciously described, following in the President's footsteps, as "flawed" [porochnyy].

On the next day, according to UPI reports, Secretary of State G. Shultz in his turn declared at the NATO Council session in the city of Halifax (Canada) that "the Reagan administration has finally decided to abrogate the SALT II agreement."

After all this, it is easy to understand the confusion that has gripped the U.S. allies, who have been given graphic proof of the results of their constant connivance with the Washington wreckers of international law who are trying to replace it with "the law of the jungle."

According to AFP reports, the new U.S. stance, "of which the allies were not informed (!) before the NATO Council session, has generated fully understandable alarm and even hostility among the Europeans." Even the most loyal U.S. allies declared at that session their disagreement with the U.S. Administration's decision.

Canadian Prime Minister B. Mulroney spoke against it and, following him, Canadian Foreign Minister J. Clark declared at the NATO Council session: "It is our belief that observance of the limits of SALT II meets the interests of arms control... It is premature to bury it."

British Foreign Secretary G. Howe, according to ABC-TV reports, claimed that SALT II "is an important part of the arms control system" and that "his country does not want to see it wrecked."

FRG Foreign Minister H.-D. Genscher spoke in the same vein, while V. Ruehe, deputy chairman of the Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union parliamentary faction, speaking at a press conference, criticized Washington for its "thoughtless withdrawal" from SALT II, warned the United States against nonobservance of the treaty, and emphasized that this issue requires a joint decision by all NATO countries.

Explaining the differences between the United States and its partners on this issue, THE WASHINGTON POST wrote on 31 March: "The allies fear that a U.S. repudiation of the policy of voluntary observance of the treaty would undermine European confidence in the United States and would revive strong antinuclear feelings in the NATO countries."

The Soviet Government's statement that it will not remain a passive bystander while the United States wrecks accords that have been achieved, and that the U.S. side should have no illusions that it may succeed in gaining military advantages for itself at the expense of the security of others, has intensified still further Europe's awareness of how adventurous and dangerous Washington's decision is. Nevertheless, those who now determine U.S. policy remain deaf to the world public's protests. Speaking a few days ago in an interview on U.S. television, C. Weinberger left no doubts that the U.S. Government intends to disregard the allies' statements, being confident that they will make a bit of noise and will then calm down. But people in NATO countries' capitals now do have something to think about. One thing is evident for the time being: All the U.S. allies, as THE WASHINGTON POST admitted, are against the Washington administration's decision. The question is, however: What lies behind this word, "against?" In the newspaper's words, the U.S. allies only "express the hope (!) that the decision announced in Washington... will not be implemented."

What can be said to this? Blessed are the believers, as the saying goes. It is hardly likely, however, that any serious politicians could expect such a miracle. The world is now at a dangerous line, beyond which lies the minefield of a totally uncontrolled arms race. What is demanded of all sober-minded people is not a high-flown "expression of hopes" but energetic and purposeful actions whose aim is to force the Washington "hawks" to halt.

West European Opposition

OW051405 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0200 GMT 5 Jun 86

[From the "Novosti" newscast; Yuriy Ulyanov commentary]

[Text] The West European public is resolutely opposed to the abrogation of the Soviet-U.S. treaty on limiting strategic strike weapons, SALT II. Our commentary:

[Ulyanov] Hello, comrades. I have in front of me a report just received over the editorial office's teletype. Roy Hattersley, deputy leader of the Labour Party, has come out with criticism of the U.S. decision to discontinue observance of the SALT II treaty in the House of Commons of the British Parliament. He said that the Government of Great Britain must demand that U.S. President Reagan strictly observe the provisions of this most important agreement.

A report from New York says that West European journalists working in the United States described as frightening President Reagan's decision to abrogate the Soviet-U.S. SALT II treaty. Appearing on a CNN TV information program, they emphasised that this White House step will create major political difficulties for ruling parties in some West European countries. Indeed, ruling circles in the West have found themselves in a difficult situation.

Washington has again announced a decision of very great importance for the destiny of the world without consulting its NATO allies. And this is far from being the first time. Without going far back in history, it suffices to mention the veto imposed by the United States on the final document of the recent conference of experts on contacts between people held in Bern. That document was discussed and preliminarily agreed upon by all the delegations. It was supported by U.S. allies. Yet Washington, defying all, said no at the last moment.

Of course, the White House views criticism from NATO countries as subdued mutiny, and it can hardly have any substantial effect on the general spirit of U.S. imperialistic policy. How can anyone, after this, accuse the Soviet Union that it allegedly tries to drive a wedge between the United States and Western Europe. We only state the facts.

Administration 'Propaganda'

LD051656 Moscow TASS in English 1629 GMT 5 Jun 86

["The 'Logic' of Opponents of Detente -- News Analysis" -- TASS item identifier]

[Text] Moscow June 5 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshev:

The Soviet Union-advanced wide-scale program for averting a nuclear holocaust, establishing a comprehensive system of international security and eliminating the mass annihilation weapons as early as before the end of the current century receives a broad backing the world over. The U.S.S.R's constructive proposals at the Soviet-American talks in Geneva on nuclear and space arms -- the proposals which make it possible to embark on the road of real disarmament without delay -- are also widely known.

But the stronger this backing the more vigorous Washington's efforts are to keep the existing tensions in international relations at the same level and to poison the political climate in the world. One of the steps taken by Washington in this direction was President Reagan's announcement about the U.S. refusal to observe SALT-1 and SALT-2 agreements in the future.

In view of the fact that world public opinion strongly condemned U.S. actions the administration would like to obscure to a maximum the meaning and the underlying motives of the decision taken. High-ranking Washington officials, specifically U.S.

Secretary of State George Shultz, Kenneth Adelman, director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Edward Rowney, special adviser to the President and the secretary of state, made a series of statements and interviews loaded with propaganda.

In a bid to justify the decision taken by the White House they distorted the real state of affairs and used arguments devoid of any logic.

Each of the mentioned speakers invented his own version of the motives and the meaning of Washington's measures to destroy the foundation of the process of arms limitation and reduction. However, an odd thesis underlies all these "explanations" -- the cause of arms limitation and reduction would be better off without the SALT-2 treaty than with it. But, then, there is nothing "odd" in it. This thesis "logically" arises from the fundamental principle of the policy of the present administration which has repeatedly maintained that the rearmament of the United States would promote the success of disarmament talks.

In this connection, it is appropriate to ask -- can one trust those who maintain that the higher the stockpiles of U.S. weapons on earth the stronger the peace, those who demolish the foundation of a building, saying in the process that they intend to build a building without a foundation? Of course not!

The unilateral denunciation of commitments under major international legal documents -- the move made by the American leadership -- attests to the desire to torpedo the process of arms limitation and reduction and fails to provide any evidence of attempts to "better it."

It is also appropriate to remind the present White House incumbent the words of his predecessor, President Carter, who, before the signing of the SALT-2 treaty, spoke aptly of the consequences which the U.S. renunciation of the treaty would entail.

President Carter said that the U.S. would lose its ability to appeal successfully to the hearts and minds of all other nations of the world and would play the role of instigator of war who refused to take part in the joint effort to limit the buildup of the most destructive weapons which mankind had ever known.

The White House has forgotten this warning. The American leadership has chosen the policy of intensifying the arms race and undermining strategic stability. Despite numerous pronouncements made by U.S. Administration officials to the effect that the United States would like to get rid of the burden of nuclear weapons, concrete actions taken by Washington bear witness to its political unpreparedness for taking concrete steps with a view to easing international tensions and eliminating nuclear weapons.

/9716
CSO: 5200/1404

XINHUA REPORTS U.S.-SOVIET RELATIONS STRAINED BY SALT II FEUD

OW040020 Beijing XINHUA in English 0001 GMT 4 Jun 86

[Round-up: U.S. Policy Shift on Salt II Brings About New Quarrels (by Shi Lujia) -- XINHUA headline]

[Text] Washington, June 3 (XINHUA) -- A series of disputes between Moscow and Washington have strained U.S.-Soviet relations since the beginning of this year on issues relevant to nuclear disarmament. Now, a new quarrel over the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT II) is fueling these disputes and overshadowing the prospect of a new Soviet-U.S. summit scheduled for later this year.

SALT II was signed by the late Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev and former U.S. President Jimmy Carter in 1979 after eight years of hard negotiation. After the Soviets invaded Afghanistan in late 1979, the U.S. Senate refused to ratify the SALT II agreement.

President Ronald Reagan has been a vocal opponent to the treaty, calling it "fatally flawed" and an agreement that would do nothing good for the United States. However, because of pressure from domestic public opinion and U.S. allies and differences within the administration, Reagan declared the United States would not undercut this treaty as long as the Soviet Union abides by it.

Then on May 27, Reagan announced that since the Soviets frequently have violated the treaty, the United States would take the "nature and magnitude" of the Soviet threat as the starting point in its development of nuclear forces instead of following restrictions set up by SALT II. But, he said, the policy would not be put into effect for the time being and whether the U.S. would adhere to the treaty depends on Soviet behavior in the following months.

Some newspapers observed that the administration shifted its stand on SALT II because Washington wanted to apply pressure to the Soviets to get the arms control talks in Geneva moving off their sluggish pace. Other newspapers argued that Reagan's statement was only a move with which the administration would please the conservatives at home.

Secretary of State George Shultz termed the change as a "shift of gears" in U.S. arms policy.

Marking a strong response from Moscow, the Soviet official news agency TASS in a commentary May 28 charged the United States with harboring an attempt to "ensure unilateral military advantages."

Some Soviet officials declared that the Soviet Union should take necessary countermeasures to defend itself and its allies if the United States abandoned SALT II. They also threatened that holding the second Soviet-American summit was in jeopardy as long as Washington sticks to its current policy on the SALT II treaty.

Last weekend, Moscow warned in a sharply worded statement that the Soviet Union no longer would be bound by the two SALT treaties and would take necessary measures to prevent the strategic equilibrium from being damaged once Reagan puts his May 27 decision into effect.

Some American politicians and West European allies have expressed reservations about the shift in U.S. policy.

According to some people, including Robert McNamara, former U.S. defense secretary during the Vietnam war, to undermine SALT II would mean abandoning the arms control structure established by four U.S. presidents in the last 20 years. And, these experts said, it would spark a surge in the arms race. During a meeting of NATO foreign ministers that closed May 30, almost all the Western Europe representatives demanded Washington reconsider its SALT II stand.

Washington intended to force Moscow to make concessions in Geneva, some American newspapers wrote, but the policy change probably would offer a chance for Moscow to launch a new propaganda campaign -- accusing Washington of having no interest in arms control and making it more difficult for any progress at the Geneva talks.

/6091
CSO: 5200/4040

CANADA: NATO FOREIGN MINISTERS DISCUSS SALT II ISSUE

Lord Carrington, Clark Remarks

Ottawa THE CITIZEN in English 29 May 86 pp A1, A20

[Article by Jim Robb]

[Text]

HALIFAX — NATO's secretary general launched a sharp attack on the vagueness of Soviet arms control proposals as foreign ministers of the western alliance gathered here Wednesday for their regular spring conference under tight security.

Lord Carrington termed the much-heralded disarmament proposals put forward earlier this year by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev "nebulous" and said it's time the Soviets put forward "real" proposals at arms talks.

"There's been too little of substance so far in what the Soviet Union has said," the NATO chief told a press conference.

The NATO foreign ministers are holding two days of mostly secret sessions today and Friday on disarmament, co-operation to stamp out state-supported terrorism, and improving alliance unity.

This is the first of their spring conferences held in Canada since 1974 and the first in a provincial capital.

Police ringed the World Trade Centre where the conference is taking place and everyone entering the building had to pass through metal detectors. As ministers arrived, surrounding streets were closed to traffic.

Lord Carrington gave strong support to President Ronald Reagan's statement this week that the United States will continue complying with terms of the SALT II treaty by scrapping two Poseidon missile submarines when one of the new Trident-class vessels takes to sea in the near future, to keep U.S. missile strength within treaty limits.

Reagan also said, however, that the U.S. will not in future observe the agreement because of alleged Soviet violations.

The NATO head suggested that the west generally has overlooked proposals by the United States for arms reductions because of fascination with Gorbachev's call for an end to nuclear weapons by the year 2000 coupled with much reduced conventional forces in Europe.

"The United States has put forward some extremely forward-looking proposals" out people, Carrington said, "somehow or other have forgotten that and have concentrated on the rather nebulous proposals which Mr. Gorbachev has put forward. "They are nebulous until such time as you see something much more concrete on a piece of paper," he said.

"If these are real proposals they should be discussed at Geneva," where the superpowers are discussing reductions in strategic nuclear weapons.

Reagan's decision to abide by the Salt II treaty limitations on nuclear warheads is a "challenge" to the Soviet Union, he said, because the Americans have complained for years that they are abiding by the treaty, never ratified by the U.S., while the Soviets have infringed its terms.

"The United States has been pretty patient... what this shows, frankly, is that there is a challenge to the Soviet Union... before the end of the year to try to do something about non-compliance." The U.S. has proposed at Geneva that strategic nuclear forces be reduced 50 per cent and longer-range intermediate weapons be abolished completely.

Carrington termed Soviet verification proposals to monitor reduction of conventional forces by East and West in Europe at arms talks in Vienna as "very inadequate."

The NATO head played down rifts in the 16-nation alliance caused by European unhappiness with the U.S. air raid on Libya in retaliation for terrorist attacks.

France and Spain refused the U.S. permission to fly F-111 fighter-bombers through their air space after they were sent aloft from bases in the United Kingdom.

Carrington said later that some of the discontent was caused by a different view of which country bore most responsibility for the terrorist attacks that prompted the American raid.

He said that while the Americans believed Libya was responsible and had to be taught a lesson, European countries viewed Syria as the more serious offender.

Prime Minister Brian Mulroney and External Affairs Minister Joe Clark arrived for the two-day conference Wednesday.

Mulroney was to hold a working breakfast meeting with the foreign ministers today just before the conference was formally opened by Carrington and Clark.

When he arrived, Clark told reporters that Canada has urged the United States to observe the arms limits imposed by Salt II.

Referring to Reagan's threat to break out of the Salt II limitations by the end of the year unless the Soviets end violations of the treaty, Clark reiterated Canada's objections to any non-compliance with Salt II by either superpower.

"We have expressed our view very strongly to the United States that we think it is in everyone's interest that the limits under Salt II be respected," he said.

"Arms limitation requires compliance by both sides. We have made that case strongly to the Soviet Union as well."

Clark mistakenly referred to a Soviet radar array at Krasnoyarsk as a Salt II violation (it actually, according to the United States, breaches the Anti Ballistic Missile treaty) and said "there are a number of other questions that we think provide evidence of non-compliance. We've raised them with the Soviets, we've asked them to respond."

First Day Sessions

Ottawa THE CITIZEN in English 30 May 86 pp A1, A4

[Article by Val Sears]

[Text]

HALIFAX — The NATO foreign ministers, alarmed by Washington's threat to break the SALT II treaty limiting nuclear arms, have joined forces against the United States in an apparently doomed effort to save the crumbling pact.

In an all-day session of the alliance's political executive here, the U.S. alone defended its position that the treaty with the Soviet Union has "outlived its usefulness" and should be scrapped.

The American delegation said that while SALT II had great "symbolic significance" for Europe, it was overrated. They said it could no longer play a useful role in arms limitation.

No choice

External Affairs Minister Joe Clark called the U.S. decision a "profoundly disturbing development and one we hoped could have been avoided."

U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz argued that the Soviet Union had broken terms of the agreement, forcing the U.S. to do the same.

The United States never ratified the treaty, which controls the number and type of nuclear missiles, but until now has stuck to its terms.

While the sessions yesterday

were secret, it was clear from briefings by various delegations that the U.S. position had left it isolated.

A British spokesman, for example, said: "Britain wants the U.S. to stay within the limits of SALT II; we made that plain as a pikestaff."

Dutch Foreign Minister Hans van den Brock said he would find it "an alarming situation" if Washington broke the treaty.

While President Ronald Reagan suggested that the United States might stick with the terms if the Soviet Union agreed to comply, it seemed clear here that the pact was dead.

The U.S. has charged that the Kremlin broke the treaty terms in three areas:

- Stationing a new missile, the SS-25;
- Coding its testing information from launches so that the U.S. could not read it;
- Building a radar station as defence against missiles.

Clark, who led off the discussions yesterday, told a the formal opening session: "It is of fundamental importance that parties to arms-control agreements comply fully with the terms of those agreements."

He said he regrets that Soviet non-compliance had forced the United States to ditch the treaty terms.

While the North Atlantic Treaty Organization split on the SALT II issue, it was united in its admiration for the political guile of Soviet Premier Mikhail Gorbachev.

"The ministers agreed he was a very shrewd political operator," a Canadian spokesman said.

"He knows how to play upon Western public opinion."

The ministers conceded that Gorbachev's skill required them to make the Western case in a more persuasive way.

At a private luncheon meeting — with no staff attending — the ministers also agreed that NATO was an appropriate forum to discuss the fight against terrorism.

Clark said earlier that "the last thing we want is to see international terrorism succeed, where the Soviet Union has failed, in dividing us."

There appeared to be agreement that intelligence information about terrorism would be shared, not only in Europe, but with Canada and the United States.

A Canadian spokesman said that as a result of yesterday's discussions, "there was a greater understanding of the various differences."

Unity threatened

NATO's unity had been threatened by the American raid on Libya and the French and Spanish refusal to allow American planes to fly over their countries.

In a private, bilateral discussion following the main sessions, Clark met with the British foreign secretary, Sir Geoffrey Howe, to discuss South Africa.

While Howe was said to have been adamant that Britain would not apply economic sanctions against South Africa, the pair agreed to wait for a commission of so-called "eminent persons" to report before any action at all was taken.

Clark accepted an invitation from Howe to visit Britain for talks in December.

/9274
CSO: 5220/40

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

SOVIET OFFICIAL ASSERTS VERIFICATION NO LONGER PROBLEM

PM041335 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 30 May 86 First Edition p 3

[L. Semeyko article under the "Events and Opinions" rubric: "Stopping the Nuclear Chariot"]

[Text] Today the problems of the peaceful and military use of the atom have fused into one. The accident at the Chernobyl AES has shown once again what awesome power nuclear energy can unleash when out of control. Concerted action by all countries is needed to ensure the safe harnessing of the great power contained within the nucleus of the atom. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's constructive proposals on deepening cooperation within the IAEA are directed precisely to that end.

At the same time the Soviet Union and the world public are convinced that the task of curbing the military use of the atom is immeasurably more important. The consequences of its being out of control would no longer be local but global in nature and would involve not isolated casualties but many hundreds of millions of human lives lost. Therein lies mankind's main anxiety. And all the various enemies of peace will not manage to shift the stress in people's awareness from the task of disarmament, and above all an immediate end to nuclear tests, to the artificially inflated problems of Chernobyl.

Stopping nuclear tests essentially means closing down the forge in which the latest means of nuclear destruction are manufactured. That is where the business of large-scale disarmament must begin. That would be the most understandable and accessible step, and would moreover be without adverse effect on the balance of the sides' nuclear might or anyone's security. The elimination of medium-range missiles in Europe and the ending of nuclear tests are the basic links which, once grasped, would make it possible to begin right now solving the whole chain of problems involved in really strengthening international and national security.

The latest extension of the unilateral Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests -- this time through 6 August of this year -- affords yet another real opportunity to solve not only very quickly and once and for all the problems of a general and complete ban on nuclear tests but -- and this is the main thing! -- also to start steadily reducing the nuclear threat facing mankind. Saying "no" to new nuclear tests means saying "yes" to progress toward a nuclear-free world and actually demonstrating one's commitment to the noble goal of eliminating nuclear weapons.

But so far Washington has refused to take the correct step. Will it ever agree to do so? The question is a serious one. We are not losing hope but neither are we slackening our vigilance. Giving the Americans a chance, even several chances, is our duty, and the USSR is discharging it.

Since the Soviet agreement to on-site verification [kontrol] of a nuclear test ban, Washington has been divested of the fig leaf that it has clutched to itself for almost a quarter of a century while refusing to ban underground nuclear explosions.

It is now clear to all that the "problem" of verification [kontrol] has ceased to be a problem. Moreover, Washington has long been aware that any nuclear explosion can be detected. People there do not see "unreliable" verification [kontrol] as the danger. "Even if a general nuclear test ban can be verified [prokontrolirovat] it will run contrary to U.S. national security interests," Assistant to the Secretary of Defense (Atomic Energy) R. Wagner told Congress. There's the rub! And Washington has now taken up those interests like a drowning man entaching at a straw. It is claimed that tests are required for as long as nuclear weapons exist and the latter are required for "deterrence." But this is the logic of people who are actually intent on perpetuating rather than eliminating nuclear weapons and on ensuring security by military-technical means rather than political measures. After all, it is always possible to "justify" a "threat to the security" of the United States and consequently not only retain nuclear weapons but modernize them ad infinitum. Which means a nonstop arms race. Since the conclusion of the Limited Test Ban Treaty (1963) 28 new types of nuclear combat munitions have been developed [razrabotano] in the United States. The latest in the line include nuclear-pumped X-ray lasers.

America's nuclear plans are causing justified concern not only to us but to sensible Americans too. The tests scheduled in the United States are not just for modernization. They are for the purpose of strategic rearmament to acquire the ability to deliver a disarming first strike. And such a course leads to the strengthening of neither American nor, even less, international security.

Our country has already demonstrated its readiness to stop nuclear tests and thereby its practical readiness for the phased elimination of nuclear arsenals. Let us recall that last July the USSR declared a moratorium on nuclear tests from 6 August through 1 January 1986 and agreed to extend it still further if the United States joined in. At the beginning of this year the moratorium was extended through 31 March and, after a certain time, for a period beyond that deadline -- until the first nuclear explosion in the United States. On 14 May M.S. Gorbachev declared that the decision had been made to extend the Soviet unilateral moratorium through 6 August of this year. This succession of examples of a true love of peace and this series of actions are designed to influence the political thinking of those who govern across the Atlantic.

The Soviet moratorium is the latest manifestation of the new poltical thinking that is so necessary if lasting security is really to be ensured. This thinking, reinforced by action, represents a breakthrough in the strategy of war prevention.

On looking at and pondering Washington's policy we now also see a change, albeit a formal and purely tactical one. Previously when Washington refused to ban nuclear tests it cited "verification [kontrol] difficulties," whereas now it cites the need to "ensure security." What is the difference? It comes to virtually the same thing: Nuclear tests have been continued and will continue. But tests, strictly scientifically speaking, are

not needed to maintain nuclear arsenals at combat readiness. There are other means available for that. This has been shown by American specialists, particularly the physicist R. Garvin, who took part in the creation of the first American hydrogen bomb.

Moscow has repeatedly proposed an urgent [bezotlagatelnyy] meeting between the CPSU Central Committee general secretary and the U.S. President to solve the problems of halting nuclear tests. The problem is too serious to be postponed. After all, we could, as of tomorrow, reach agreement on fundamentally important steps in this sphere to break the deadlock. And then there would also be the other, previously planned summit meeting, where accord could be reached on other disarmament problems. Only the political will is needed to make step-by-step progress, overcoming the obstacles of mistrust, suspicion, and enmity, and demonstrating by practical deeds the readiness for new approaches in world politics.

In the prevailing conditions, where attention is so intensely focused on nuclear questions, you must be able to learn lessons. Lessons from Chernobyl. Lessons from American actions since Geneva, including their systematic refusal of a complete and decisive ban on holding further nuclear tests. Lessons from frequent American accidents involving missile and nuclear equipment that occurred in the distant and also quite recent past. And lessons too from the intentions of America "to worm its way out of" the ABM and Salt II treaties.

Mindful of the real situation, the USSR is doing its utmost to avert the worst. That cannot be said of the United States, whose actions are imcompatible with political morality and common sense. It is time it was realized that to live today in terms of past is to commit a crime against the future.

/9716
CSO: 5200/1403

PRAVDA CORRESPONDENT ON U.S. MOTIVES FOR OPPOSING MORATORIUM

PM301057 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 May 86 First Edition p 4

[Own correspondent V. Gan report: "What For? Washington Against the Moratorium"]

[Excerpt] Washington, May -- Many letters have recently arrived at PRAVDA's Washington correspondents center from American citizens, as well as statements by prominent public figures and members of the U.S. Congress. All the letters convey roughly the same feelings. This is not surprising when you realize that it could not be otherwise. The Smiths, Browns, and Johnsons, like millions of their neighbors in the world, are equally grieved and alarmed by the realization that their common home could collapse into the abyss at any moment.

While I was writing these lines, it was announced on the radio that there had been another explosion at the Nevada test range, the 4th this year and the 11th since the imposition of the Soviet moratorium. The tests, as an official spokesman for the U.S. Department of Energy announced, "were related to armaments." That is the administration's latest answer to the new appeal made by the USSR, which has extended its moratorium until 6 August -- the anniversary of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima.

The annual report of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to the U.S. Congress has been published here. The report sets forth officially, in documentary form, the government's position on questions of military developments, foreign policy, and its approach to Soviet-American talks. It makes things out to be better than they are. "Considerations regarding limitations on nuclear tests continue to be taken into account in U.S. policy," it declares. There is not a shadow of truth in that statement. In fact, Washington has shut itself off completely from Soviet appeals to turn these benevolent "considerations" into the long awaited practical actions. So the administration starts dodging, evading, putting forward banal excuses and at times outright lies.

The report claims, in particular, that the continuation of nuclear tests is necessary in order to "ensure the effectiveness of our deterrence forces and the reliability and safety of the U.S. nuclear arsenal." "In view of the scope and scale of the buildup of the Soviet Armed Forces," it says, "it is vitally important that we safeguard the strategic balance that has helped us preserve peace between East and West all these years." And further: "Nuclear tests help to ensure confidence in our deterrence forces by making it possible to modernize our nuclear arms."

But, first, the Soviet Union has never threatened anyone, and the "Soviet military threat" is an idle fabrication. Second, it was not U.S. actions which helped to "ensure peace" throughout these years, but the policy of the USSR and the other socialist countries.

What is absolutely true in the report is that nuclear tests do indeed make it possible to carry out arms modernization. This modernization is taking place in line with Washington's course of securing military-strategic advantages and wrecking the approximate parity of forces between the USSR and the United States. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that in recent years a situation has arisen in the country where, as one newspaper put it, "the government does not control arms, arms controls the government."

Washington's obstructionist approach to a nuclear test ban and to disarmament questions is based on the fantastic profits flowing into the military-industrial complex. There is even an expression on Wall Street -- "New frontiers of profit." You only have to glance at the figures relating to the contracts of just the leading Pentagon contractors for it to become clear what this means. Last year, for instance, the McDonnell Douglas corporation received military orders worth $8.9 billion, General Dynamics $7.4 billion, Rockwell International $6.3 billion, General Electric $5.9 billion, and Boeing $5.5 billion.

Here it is of some importance to note that hundreds of millions of dollars were received for the development [razrabotka] of qualitatively new types of arms, which is the purpose of some of the nuclear tests. In particular, within the framework of the "star wars" program alone, the Pentagon has already given out contracts worth $2 billion. When you take into account that according to the most approximate estimates the cost of the plans for space militarization will amount to $2 trillion purely in the initial period, one can say without fear of exaggeration: The administration's decision not to ban nuclear tests was taken at the headquarters of the military-industrial corporations. How can there be any question of a moratorium, of an awareness of civic and political responsibility, when you are plunged into a paradise of dollars? After all, the adoption of the moratorium would mean a significant step toward curbing the arms race.

What could then be done with the x-ray and optical lasers for "star wars," the microwave guns, the Midgetman charges and charges for Trident-2, and the dozens, if not hundreds, of other programs?

The answer is obvious. That is why it is rare for a day to go by without the American press reporting more and more new requests from the administration -- first for several billion more dollars to "expand capacities for the production of nuclear weapons," then for $2 billion to "improve the Nevada test complex," then for funds to "study the question of whether the United States should develop a new mobile missile with cluster warheads," then something else in the same vein. And the number of explosions in Nevada grows. "Whereas formerly about 6 explosions were usually needed in order to create a new weapon," THE NEW YORK TIMES writes, "work on just one of today's more complex types of arms can take 100-200 explosions."

All this is connected with the political decision, made in favor of the military-industrial complex, to raise the nuclear arms race to a qualitatively new and, therefore, still more dangerous level. Of course, a Soviet-American moratorium would hamper this. C. Pell, senator from Rhode Island, incidentally pointed this out during the hearings now taking place in Congress on the question of banning nuclear explosions.

However, the appeals and demands to see reason and at last display responsibility make no impact on the administration. The military-industrial complex lobbyists stick to their guns and assure us that a test ban "would do absolutely nothing for nuclear disarmament" (Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Admiral W. Crowe), that "a world free from nuclear arms is not practicable" (Assistant Defense Secretary R. Perle), that "the moratorium on nuclear tests proposed by the USSR is an invitation to a total ban on explosions, which is not verifiable" (R. (Bekker), deputy assistant director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency).

Upon going to Congress and hearing such remarks, you realize how right B. Frank, member of the House of Representatives, is when he says that "the barrier in the path of progress is no longer the lack of the technology for verification, it is the deliberate policy of Washington." There is no arguing with the conclusion of journalist M. Kinsli, who wrote that "the administration's supposed arguments to explain its rejection of Soviet proposals for a total nuclear test ban exude insincerity."

It should be added that it is not only a question of insincerity. By rejecting the USSR's responsible, constructive step, the U.S. Administration provided unambiguous evidence that it puts the interest of military-industrial circles above the interests of its own people and of all mankind. Yet the nuclear age demands new political thinking and a new policy. To close your eyes to this and refuse to take account of the realities of the present day is to commit an unforgivable error that it will be difficult, and perhaps downright impossible, to rectify.

/9716
CSO: 5200/1403

INDIAN PRIME MINISTER PRAISES NUCLEAR MORATORIUM EXTENSION

LD190717 Moscow TASS in English 0528 GMT 19 May 86

[Article by TASS correspondent Vladimir Baidashin--TASS byline]

[Text] New Delhi, May 19 TASS--Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi, chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement, expressed wholehearted support for the Soviet Union's decision to extend its unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing till August 6.

Speaking to newsmen at the Delhi Airport after returning from a tour of several African nations, he said that decision had demonstrated that the Soviet Union's attitude to nuclear disarmament was most serious.

Answering questions from this correspondent, he said that the next meeting of six nations of five continents on nuclear disarmament would take place on August 6 and the participants at that meeting hoped that other nuclear powers would also take constructive steps similar to the ones taken by the Soviet Union.

On a recent reply by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to a message from the leaders of the six nations of five continents, Rajiv Gandhi said the Soviet Union always reacted positively to the initiatives of those countries on nuclear disarmament.

Sometimes the Soviet Union went even further than those nations asked it to and they hailed that attitude.

Some people claimed, Rajiv Gandhi said, that the Soviet Union did all that for propaganda purposes. The six nations, however, would like to see similar "propaganda" on the part of also other countries. But other nuclear powers, regrettably, had not reacted in a similar way to the six nations' proposals.

/9716
CSO: 5200/1403

USSR: U.S. DEFIES PUBLIC OPINION ON TEST BAN

'Shameless Lies'

LD212324 Moscow TASS in English 1406 GMT 21 May 86

[Text] Moscow May 25 TASS--Follows commentary by Yuriy Kornilov, TASS political news analyst:

A collection of materials presented to Congress reflecting the stand of the U.S. Administration on the key disarmament issues has been issued in Washington. The collection of documents says that Washington further intends to carry on nuclear weapons testing. This was also reaffirmed by Richard Perle, U.S. assistant secretary of defence. Speaking in Washington, he said that this year the USA would conduct at least 15 nuclear blasts.

This militaristic line is clearly in conflict with the explicitly expressed will of an overwhelming majority of nations of the world. Sensible political figures in the United States itself even more often point to the danger of this policy. With every new test the USA makes a step back in the process of arms control, Senator Edward Kennedy pointed with the good reason.

The returns of the public opinion poll carried out in the USA by the "Opinion Research Corporation" are evidence that 60 per cent of American favour an end to nuclear blasts. Yet, apparently, the stand of American public means nothing to those in Washington, who in forming the fundamentals of United States policy proceed not from the interests of peace, not from the national interests of their own country, but lay emphasis on the selfish and imperial ambition of the military industry complex.

"Propaganda support" has been ensured for Washington's militaristic policy, which is based on illusory, but extremely dangerous calculations to break by all means the military strategic parity in their favour.

While all sensible people received the news of the Chernobyl tragedy as another tolling of the bell, as another stern warning that this nuclear age requires new political mentality and new policy, certain U.S. and NATO circles see in what has happened only a fresh opportunity to put up additional obstacles in the way of development of the East-West dialogue, to justify the nuclear weapons race, to try to discredit the USSR and its peaceable policy.

In issuing shameless lies about our country, malevolent cock-and bull stories about the Chernobyl accident, they are trying to lessen the international impact of the Soviet proposals on an end to nuclear testing, on the elimination of nuclear weapons and at the same time bring down the mounting criticism of the conduct of the USA itself.

Now after the Soviet Union has extended its unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing till August 6, it is obvious to every sane person that if the U.S. Administration responded to that good initiative, made a step, which is expected from it by all peoples, the possibility of putting an end to all nuclear blasts and consequently the possibility to start movement towards the elimination of nuclear weapons would become quite real.

The paramount significance of that objective was obvious in the past, the more so it is obvious today after the Chernobyl accident has once again demonstrated what abyss will open if nuclear war breaks out.

Yet through Washington's fault, the USSR's unilateral moratorium has not become bilateral and not stopped the conduct of nuclear tests, at least so far. This fact most clearly shows who is really for eliminating the nuclear threat and who, while getting away with pseudo peace-making rhetoric, continue building up their nuclear arsenals feverishly, are banking on a further increase in the potential of the mass destruction weapons.

Today the U.S. ruling circles and those who support their policy, have again a real opportunity to display a sense of realism and responsibility and demonstrate not just by word of mouth, but in action their goodwill. As far as the Soviet land is concerned it is deeply convinced that an end should be put to nuclear testing.

'Deaf to World Opinion'

OW230404 Moscow Television Service 0200 GMT 23 May 86

[From the Novosti newscast; Serikov commentary]

[Text] The new U.S. nuclear explosion was met with resolute condemnation by the world. Our commentator.

[Serikov] Hello comrades. Only a week has passed since the day our country announced its extension of the unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing. Once again we have shown our good intentions, our determination to explore all possibilities, and our desire to influence by example the U.S. position on the nuclear question. The new constructive proposals of the Soviet Union were met by a large and positive response, which is understandable, seeing that they are consistent with the hopes and aspirations of the people of the world.

However large the tragedy at Chernobyl, it in no way compares to the ramifications of the scope of the numerous catastrophes hidden in nuclear arsenals stockpiled around the world. Understanding this, many government and social

figures have highly evaluated our position. An act of unprecedented state wisdom was what Professor Bernard Lown, cochairman of the doctors against nuclear war movement, called the decision of the Soviet Union.

However, the White House is remaining, once again, deaf to the demands of world opinion--or is pretending that it is deaf, for it is hard to believe that only the explosions on the Nevada test site can be heard there, while other explosions, those of indignation and outrage, are being totally ignored. Yesterday's nuclear test was the eleventh such test by the United States since 6 August 1985 when we introduced the unilateral moratorium. It is the eleventh time Washington has mocked the most valued and natural wish of the people to live. By this act, Washington has proven the anti-human essence of its policies.

The mayor of Nagasaki, the victim-city of a U.S. atomic bombardment, made a strong protest to the U.S. Government and demanded an immediate end to all nuclear explosions. All honest people of the world are lending their voices to this protest.

Protest in Nevada

LD311441 Moscow TASS in English 1401 GMT 31 May 86

[Text] Moscow May 31 TASS--By TASS news analyst Vassiliy Kharkov:

A protest demonstration which American peace campaigners plan to stage near the Pentagon's test range in Nevada Saturday and next Monday comes as fresh proof of the fact that the movement for a nuclear test ban is gathering momentum in the United States.

Many anti-war organizations and groups are among the organizers of the demonstration which is expected to be a representative one with many people participating.

It is noteworthy that peace activists from other countries, notably Great Britain, West Germany, Japan, New Zealand and others, expressed the desire to take part.

It is symbolic that such a massive demonstration will be held near the test range in the Nevada desert where the Pentagon has been modernizing nuclear weapons for many years now. It shows that broad sections of the American public deplore the administration's reluctance to terminate nuclear testing and its desire to continue intensifying the nuclear arms race.

Millions of Americans welcomed the gesture of goodwill made by the Soviet Union which extended unilaterally its moratorium on nuclear explosions for the third time -- till next August 6. The question why Washington refuses to follow the Soviet Union's noble example, as THE BOSTON GLOBE newspaper admitted, can be heard ever more often across the United States, characterizing the sentiments of many Americans.

But Americans are not simply asking this question. They are increasingly aware of the fact that vigorous actions and large-scale demonstrations are required to make Washington reckon with desire of the American people and with the striving of the international community for the termination of the arms race that threatens mankind with a nuclear holocaust.

More and more people from different walks of life join in the movement in the United States for the termination of nuclear tests and for a bilateral Soviet-American moratorium. These are religious figures, prominent scientists, public figures and politicians, congressmen, and others. Opinion polls taken in the United States show that a majority of Americans are opposed to the continued U.S. nuclear testing.

The U.S. Administration's reluctance to reckon with this fact confirms that it is promoting only the interests of the military-industrial complex and of the ultra-right-wing forces which are concerned solely with boosting their profits derived from the arms race and which entertain the futile hope that the United States might, one day, achieve military superiority.

/9716
CSO: 5200/1403

SENATOR URGES U.S. TEST BAN AT NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY

LD261529 Moscow TASS in English 1446 GMT 26 May 86

[Text] Luxembourg, May 26--TASS correspondent Albert Balebanov reports:

Luxembourg's Prime Minister Jacques Senter today urged the parliamentarians of the 16-member countries of the North Atlantic Assembly to promote an earlier achievements of agreements between the United States and the Soviet Union on disarmament matters, the widening and deepening of a dialogue and contacts.

On his part, president of the North Atlantic Assembly Senator Charles Mathias of the United States urged the parliamentarians to press that the United States follow the Soviet Union's example and stop its nuclear testing, that Washington continue adhering to the existing agreements with the USSR on limitation and should not jeopardize by its star wars programme the prospects for talks on disarmement that are of exxeptional importance for mankind's future. The main theme of the debates at the spring session of the North Atlantic Assembly that ended today were the U.S.-West European differences which touched upon such important aspects of transatlantic and international relations as commercial and economic ties, cooperation in the military sphere, east-west relations, ways and methods of combatting terrorism.

/9716
CSO: 5200/1403

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

MOSCOW BROADCAST: TEST BAN COULD END ARMS RACE

LD021811 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 1 Jun 86

["Top Priority" program presented by Pavel Kuznetsov with Prof Radomir Bogdanov and Prof Sergey Plekhanov]

[Excerpts] Radio Moscow presents "Top Priority" and I'm Pavel Kuznetsov, your host. Together with me in the studio are Professors Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekhanov and the issue for today is a comprehensive nuclear test ban. On 21 May, the United States detonated another nuclear device in Nevada. The Department of Energy said that the yield was slightly below 20 kilotons and that the test was weapons related. On the one hand we have 11 American blasts since the Soviet Union stopped all nuclear testing and on the other hand we have three Soviet extensions of its unilateral moratorium. Professor Bogdanov, don't you think we have a rather unique situation between the world's leading military powers?

[Bogdanov] What is unique Pavel? It seems to me it's the usual situation in the Soviet-American arms race. We are always behind the Americans, we are always catching up with the Americans. But this time what is unique really [is] that we don't catching up with them at all. [sentence as heard] (?They have just stopped testing). Now, my problem is not counting down how many tests they had. My problem is why they don't join us, that's my problem, you know? And I'm afraid that many people in the world have the same question. Our position is very simple, maybe the simplest in the world: You just stop testing and you are — by that you're killing the nuclear devil -- step by step. That's very simple for the Americans to join us. Why? Because it doesn't intervene with anybody's security, real security. Now you have such a high-tech computers that you can on computers to check up your device, nuclear device, whether it will detonate or not. You don't need to detonate it in the dune you know.

[Kuznetsov] You're talking about a so-called reliability test?

[Bogdanov] Yes, a reliability test and (?I'm aimed at) one very interesting problem. How many explanations the American side had about why they don't join the Soviet Union. I don't [word indistinct] and they're so different that I'm at a loss [word indistinct] which one's the real one. Now I believe that they're telling the truth. You should always test new models, always new models of nuclear weapons.

That's one side of the story but I'm afraid and my suspicion is that it's more than that. It's going about "star wars," that's where the dog is lying you know. That's the "star war" problem. They say that "star wars," that this American President states that "star

wars" has nothing to do with the nuclear weapons, they are just meant to, you know, to abolish nuclear weapons. Now, they are testing nuclear devices which are meant to activize [as heard] nuclear laser, you know that's their main problem now. Now my question is where is the nonnuclear SDI? My statement is, you know, my message is that nuclear testing, it's another way out to get a nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union and to achieve the first strike capability by one way or the other, now I'm absolutely sure.

[Kuznetsov] My question to you, Professor Plekhanov: Reputed American journalists like James Reston and Tom Wicker tell us that a comprehensive test ban was a stated goal of every American Administration since Dwight Eisenhower to Jimmy Carter and President Reagan too put a test ban on his list of foreign policy priorities and when he came to office, when he was elected. But then he dropped it from his list of priorities. Why?

[Plekhanov] Well I don't think that the idea of a test ban was anywhere high on their list of priorities. Maybe it was one of the campaign promises that they had to make in order not to sound too extremist in their approach to military matters. I'm saying this because one of the first things that was done by the Reagan administration when it came to power was to discontinue American participation in the comprehensive test ban talks, the talks that were going on between the Soviet Union, the United States and Great Britain for years, and the talks that brought the three powers almost to the final point of agreement. The treaty, by 1980, the treaty on comprehensive test ban was 95 or 90 percent ready. But then the United States dropped out of that endeavor.

So I think it would be more accurate to speak of their priority (?as) dropping out of the test ban talks and the reason why they do it is very simple, because they don't believe in stopping the development of new kinds of weapons. They think that this idea of modernizing what they call the deterrent, modernizing their strategic forces, is something which is necessary for American security. Now we have seen in the American foreign policy thinking, we've seen a retrogression to a prenuclear mode of approach to how you provide for your security. We've seen a trend toward relying on force, on unilateral use of force, on the ability of the United States to threaten others who may not agree with them on this or that point and in order to effectively threaten you need to have what they call a deterrent. The greater it is the more credible your threat.

[Kuznetsov] The past administration also talked about the need to modernize their weapons and still they talked , kept talking about a test ban. And they not only talked, we know that in 1973 [as heard] there was a partial test ban treaty.

[Plekhanov] That's right. You referred to the earlier attempt. Now it's important to keep in mind that when the partial test ban was concluded in 1963, a rationale behind the military establishment, the establishment's consent with the treaty, they were not happy about the treaty and there was some open dissent in the military circles in the United States but they went along on the condition that the program of underground nuclear tests would go at full speed. In fact they thought that the United States was technologically ahead of the Soviet Union and they thought that by eliminating, by banning atmospheric tests they would be able to gain an upper hand over the Soviet Union. So even in that kind of measure they were looking at it for some advantages over the Soviet Union and now when the question is about stopping all kinds of tests, stopping underground tests, this is a kind of a final point. I mean if you ban them it's curtains for a nuclear arms race. It's very difficult to race if there is no testing. So this is a last stand of the people who believe in nuclear weapons and nuclear wars and winning nuclear wars and so on.

[Kuznetsov] Professor Bogdanov, I want to combine two questions in one and put them to you. You know better than I do that our moratorium since it was announced is presented as propaganda and at the same time we know we get a lot of letters in our local press, on television and radio where people, Soviet people, are truly concerned about our moratorium in the sense that while the United States keeps testing and we don't they are in for getting ahead of us, for surging ahead of us and acquiring military superiority. Perhaps we're overdoing with our moratorium.

[Bogdanov] You know, once I said to our American listeners over there if we are accused in that kind of propaganda I accept it.

This is really a propaganda, propaganda for peace. There is nothing wrong with that, that's number one. Number two: I agree with (?you), it's becoming really embarrassing and little bit worrisome. They continue testing and we stop that and in our high technology (?year) when time passes in such a quick way, it's really, we are losing time, we don't do anything. Why? I sometimes -- I put the same question to myself and to my many friends and maybe your friends, and your friends Sergey, while discussing with us, they also put that question: How long? How long? You know I believe that our leadership is in that particular thing they're very right, you know. Let's divide the problem into two parts, one is security and the other one is moral part of the story.

Security, what is security nowadays, you know? I believe, to be frank with you, whatever it is already in the nuclear arsenal is more than enough, I emphasize, it's more than enough to destroy each other maybe 12 times, or 10 times, it makes, for me personally it makes no difference how many times...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] One time is enough I think.

[Bogdanov] One time, maybe quarter of a time is enough to destroy [word indistinct] I don't worry about numbers.

[Plekhanov] I think that one need not counterpose security and morality in this particular case because really with this overkill capability, building up more weapons does not make anyone secure. So participating in this mad race toward oblivion, and not trying to stop it by one's own example would be a big mistake, if one realizes how terrible the nuclear weapons are and how many of them there are.

[Kuznetsov] In other words you suggest that they do not realize this in Washington?

[Plekhanov] They prefer, they prefer...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] The other way?

[Plekhanov] No they prefer not to believe in that. They think that they can intimidate others if they have more than others, which is a very cynical viewpoint because they know that nuclear weapons are not usable. But you see there is a vicious circle here. If you value nuclear weapons for their intimidating capacity, and yet if you know that they are not usable then you're, the credibility of your threat diminishes because nobody will believe that they will use them. So the logic of those people is let's make the world believe that we can and will use them if we are, if we have to. When Richard Nixon was president he grappled with this dilemma and he said, came up

with something like a mad president theory. He said that our credibility increases if the adversary thinks that I am capable of mad acts. Now this is the insane logic which is behind this (?talk).

[Bogdanov] But you know I am afraid that this administration is not following the same line. They are very open in their you know, in their action. They are telling openly that we need new arms. We come across quite a number of statements in the Congress about that: We are testing because we need new modernized, more accurate arms, nuclear arms -- that's all. That's the answer. What for? Just to prevail over the Soviet Union, that's very simple.

[Kuznetsov] My question to you, Professor Plekhanov, why do you think is, there is such a vicious campaign against a test ban, do you think it's because it's so appealing to the general public, or what?

[Plekhanov] Well of course, it's a simple idea, it's a correct idea, it's one of those things that's just a direct hit at a very sensitive spot in this structures of the arms race, and that's why it hurts, I mean it really hurts.

[Kuznetsov] And perhaps that's why it's called propaganda?

[Plekhanov] That's why it's called propaganda, but no matter what you call it...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] It's very well, it's easily understood by everybody.

[Plekhanov] That's right and besides, you know, it's not just talking, it's doing, or rather not doing, desisting from doing some bad things, and so the continuation of a moratorium I think is a very persuasive thing, and the administration, the Reagan administration is just feeling the pinch.

[Kuznetsov] Our time is running out and I'd like to end this edition of "Top Priority" with a question to you, Professor Bogdanov. A few days ago President Reagan again said that his administration intends to scrap the SALT II treaty by the end of the year when more B-52 strategic bombers are equipped with longrange cruise missiles. Do you see any connection between their policy on a test ban and a series of statements concerning the intention to break out of the SALT II treaty?

[Bogdanov] I believe that all that belongs to the same category of things. It's another buildup of military superiority over the Soviet Union. If you ask me what is the difference between President's statement and all his previous statements about SALT II my answer is very short. For the first time the President didn't mention that he is doing that for the sake of saving the treaty, he said that he has destroyed that just because economically it's not profitable to keep them...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] In service, yes.

[Bogdanov] In service. Then you have another threat against the Soviet Union. If you don't dance on our music we will scrap the treaty [word indistinct] so it's another act of intimidation, that's my answer.

[Kuznetsov] In other words the limits of the previous accords are too tight for them?

[Bogdanov] Oh yeah, you do not need to be a great -- you know -- expert in arms control, you just should look at what's going on in the American military establishment and what is the military, or defense policy of this administration. The answer is there. Treaties are no more valuable for (?that), they are just you know (?tidying) their accounts, that's my answer.

[Plekhanov] (?Pie crusts) to be broken.

[Kuznetsov] Yes, thank you very much, thank you very much, our time is up. This is "Top Priority," I am Pavel Kuznetsov, good-bye till next week at the same time and on the same wavelengths.

/9716
CSO: 5200/1403

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS: U.S. TIMES TEST FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION DAY

LD051819 Moscow TASS in English 1743 GMT 5 Jun 86

[Text] Washington June 5 TASS — TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko reports:

Another nuclear test was conducted in an underground silo at the Nevada test range today. That was this year's fifth nuclear test officially announced by the U.S. Department of Energy and the twelfth one since the Soviet Union introduced a unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions on August 6, 1985. The yield of the explosion was from 20 to 150 kilotons, and, as a spokesman of the Nevada test range has stated, "had a bearing on nuclear arms."

Thus, the test has provided a fresh evidence of the administration's criminal disregard for the world public demands for an end to the nuclear arms race, for the prevention of its transfer to outer space and for safeguarding mankind against a nuclear catastrophe. According to official data, the Nevada nuclear test codenamed "tajo" has brought to 651 the number of nuclear tests announced by the United States since 1951.

Administration spokesmen keep stating that after the start of the conduct of nuclear tests underground, the tests no longer pose danger from the viewpoint of a discharge of radiation into the atmosphere. However, such assertions are quite far from the truth. Even officially it was admitted that in a number of cases such a discharge did occur, poisoning the environment and impairing people's health. According to expert estimates, the aggregate leak of radiation during the conduct of underground nuclear explosions in Nevada by far exceeds the release of radiation as a result of the Chernobyl accident over which a wave of hysteria was stirred up in the United States on the plea of "care" for countries which neighbour on the Soviet Union. The mendacity of the administration's assertions as to its "concern" for the environment and human health is emphasized by the fact that the explosion "tajo" was pointedly timed for the world Environmental Protection Day which is traditionally observed by a U.N. decision on June 5.

No less mendacious are the administration's assertions that the USA's refusal to discontinue nuclear tests and thus put an end to the sophistication of nuclear arms and prevent the development of new types of nuclear weapons, including space systems, is ostensibly accounted for by the administration's desire to promote talks on reaching agreement on a reduction in nuclear arms and even on their complete elimination. It was precisely such "arguments" that were adduced on the eve of the nuclear test in Nevada in President Reagan's message to Congress. In the message, he demanded that the adminstration's request for appropriations for military needs for the 1987 fiscal year be fully satisfied.

The message pointed out that the United States would go ahead with implementing the U.S. "strategic modernisation program" and speed up the realisation of the "star wars" program.

In the area of the Nevada test range, police arrested another group of activists of the movement for an end to nuclear tests. The activists who keep round-the-clock vigil have set themselves as an object to attract the attention of as broad circles of U.S. population as possible to the administration's stubborn unwillingness to listen to the voice of reason and to join the Soviet moratorium with a view to elaborating a treaty on a total and final ban on nuclear tests as soon as possible.

/9716
CSO: 5200/1403

IZVESTIYA EDITORIAL ARTICLE ASSAILS U.S. NUCLEAR TESTING PLANS

PM031543 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Jun 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Editorial article: "From a Position of Recklessness; How Washington Explains the Desire to Continue Nuclear Tests"]

[Text] It was 30 years ago, in June 1956, when the USSR Supreme Soviet issued a statement that noted the following: The Western powers negative attitude toward the Soviet Union's constructive proposals aimed at the liquidation of the nuclear threat to mankind "will not deter the Soviet Union in its struggle for a complete ban on atomic weapons and for the urgent termination of thermonuclear weapons tests as a first step along this path." It is due to opposition by the West, and primarily the United States, that this task even today appears on the agenda of international life. Furthermore, the need for its swiftest possible solution today is incalculably greater than 3 decades ago. This why the USSR's stance, outlined with utmost clarity in the 15 January statement by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, confirmed by the 27th CPSU Congress, and enshrined in the CPSU Program, is to attain "the stage-by-stage implementation of a complete liquidation of nuclear weapons by the end of the 20th century by way of terminating the tests and production of all their varieties." Proceeding from this premise, the Soviet Union actively and consistently advocates the termination of nuclear tests. The latest confirmation of this is contained in the Soviet Union's recent decision to extend the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions until 6 August.

What is the West doing? How did the United States respond to this decision? On 21 May, the Pentagon conducted yet another nuclear explosion at the Nevada test site, the 4th officially announced test of 1986 and the 11th since the Soviet moratorium was announced, and the 650th since 1951. This, and other similar actions, need no extensive interpretations. The White House openly expresses unwillingness to join the Soviet moratorium and displays an intention to continue nuclear tests.

Today it can be confidently asserted that a belief has developed and is strengthening among the international community as a whole that the termination of nuclear tests is a practical step toward the liquidation of nuclear arms and, moreover, does not lead to the undermining of anyone's security. The people can draw closer to the cherished goal only if our example is also followed by the other nuclear powers, primarily the United States. Washington, however, refuses to accept Moscow's invitation for a joint approach toward a nuclear-free future.

What is it that encourages the White House to reject the hand extended to it? Why is it that explosions thunder time and time again in the Nevada desert, reducing the people's hopes to ashes? The U.S. Administration justifies its stance by the following selection

of deductions: Nuclear arsenals are needed by the United States as "means of deterrence against the enemy," nuclear weapons must be constantly checked in order to maintain the "reliability and effectiveness" of these "means of deterrence," and such checking is possible only by conducting nuclear explosions.

K. Adelman, director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, outlined this "concept" with exhaustive bluntness. "We hope," he declared, "to reduce nuclear arms, we hope to conclude accords and develop technology that could change the prevailing situation to a greater or lesser extent. To this point, however, such changes have not occurred, and an imperative need for deterrence exists as before. In order to ensure the reliability and effectiveness of our means of deterrence it is necessary to conduct tests of the weapons that constitute these means. Tests are necessary to ensure deterrence."

Let us leave to the director's conscience the claim that he hopes to reduce nuclear arms. It does not in the least correspond with Washington's practical policy.

The United States, with its actions, destroys people's hopes that accords on curbing the nuclear race can be reached. However, this is not the only issue. Let us examine more carefully the term "deterrence" with which Adelman is juggling.

The White House has its own interpretation of this concept. The same interpretation was given in National Security Council Memorandum 68, which was ratified by H. Truman back in his days as U.S. President. This is what this document says: "Under the deterrence concept, it is seen as vitally necessary to maintain a strong military position... Without the basis of superior military strength in a state of combat readiness and able to be rapidly mobilized, the deterrence policy, which to all intents and purposes is a policy of planned and gradual coercion, will be nothing but a policy of bluff." In other words: The U.S. concept of "deterrence" is aimed at creating military superiority over the USSR, which would allow the United States to pursue a "policy of gradual and planned coercion" against our country and the entire world. Washington does not envision a "deterrence policy" without its nuclear arms. While this political course is a categorical imperative for the U.S. Administration, the White House does not want to hear about the elimination of nuclear arms that the Soviet Union is calling for and is prepared to undertake.

An analysis of the other "arguments" adduced by the U.S. side to justify its refusal to join in the Soviet moratorium only emphasizes Washington's bad faith in its approach to the most important problem of the day.

For instance, the White House puts forward the "verification (kontrol) problem" again and again. Is verification (kontrol) of the observance of accords necessary? Of course it is. Perhaps the Soviet Union needs it even more than the United States. The facts attest to repeated cases of the U. S. side exceeding the limit for its tests of nuclear charges, a limit that was laid down by the treaties on underground nuclear weapons and on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes (these treaties, signed in 1974 and 1976 respectively, have still not been ratified by the United States, thereby thwarting the measures envisaged by these documents aimed at improving the sides' confidence in the precise implementation of accords). Instances of U.S. violations of the 1963 treaty banning nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, outerspace, and under water, when radioactive material was scattered beyond U.S. national territory as a result of underground nuclear explosions are also well known.

In light of these facts it is obvious that the Soviet Union is interested in reliable verification [kontrol] of accords, no less than the United States at any rate. But Washington is pretending that it knows absolutly nothing about this Soviet position.

No less "convincing" is the thesis put forward by G. Shultz opposing a U.S. moratorium on nuclear explosions. The U.S. secretary of state, explaining to congressmen the reasons for refusing to introduce a moratorium, stated that it would be unrealistic "while there are no agreements on fundamental reductions to nuclear arsenals." Yes, there really are no such agreements yet. But, first, the explosions intended to modernize and upgrade nuclear arsenals not only do not promote the conclusion of such agreements but put more and more obstacles in the way. Second, the(ending) of nuclear tests -- since it freezes the qualitative parameters of nuclear arms -- would only promote reaching accords on fundamental reductions to nuclear arsenals. This is precisely what the United States does not want, gambling on achieveing nuclear missile omnipotence. This is borne out by the decision made in Washington essentially to abandon SALT II, a step that has been assessed in the world and in the Soviet Government statement published a few days ago as provocative.

Hiding the blatantly aggressive nature of its policy behind the term "deterrence," whose true meaning has been concealed from the broad circles of the Western public, Washington is counting on the fact that the world will also understand the thesis on holding nuclear tests as a means of "ensuring the reliability and effectiveness of the means of deterrence." But what "reliability" and effectiveness is that?

The United States pretends that only those kinds and types of armaments already in the nuclear arsenals are subject to "reliability and effectiveness" tests. But their combat readiness has already been established with a sufficient degree of reliability in tests held in the past. Specialists are convinced that nuclear test explosions are not necessary to verify the reliability of a nuclear weapon. Reliability can be established, Western experts claim, by testing the nonnuclear components of nuclear weapons.

Explosions conducted with the aim of modernizing existing nuclear armaments and creating new, more sophisticated and more destructive forms are another matter. The facts demonstrate that Washington's desire to retain its "right" to conduct nuclear explosions is aimed precisely at the qualitative reequipment of its nuclear arsenals, not at "verifying reliability." In this connection the U.S. press has reported that the Pentagon intends to use the more than 15 explosions planned for this year to test new nuclear warheads for MX ICBM's, B-61 tactical bombs and B-83 strategic bombs, 8-inch and 155-mm nuclear artillery shells, warheads for Midgetman missiles and submarine-based Trident-2 missiles, new nuclear depth charges, nuclear antiaircraft missiles based on SM-2 ships, SRAM-2 short-range air to surface nuclear missiles, and so on and so forth. By no means least in this program is the place occupied by space-strike armaments, that new element intended to transform the present U.S. nuclear "triad" into a "quartet." There is no doubt that ending nuclear tests is a clear obstacle to all these preparations for Armageddon. For the people of the world, including the American people, of course, that would undoubtedly be a boon. But it is not "boon for mankind that the White House is thinking about now -- rather, it is a "policy of planned and gradual coercion" based on "superior military strength." That is how Washington understands "deterrence," incapable as it is of abandoning the concept formulated by U.S. strategists approximately 35 years ago.

But it is not the middle of the 20th century that is before us now: Rather, we are on the threshhold of the 3d millennium. And to try to act "from a position of strength" is a venture as futile as it is dangerous. The present level of the military-strategic balance between the opposing sides is approaching a critical point and the continuation of the nuclear arms race, for which Washington is striving, merely thickens the clouds of the nuclear catastrophe threatening the planet.

The 27th CPSU Congress stressed that the doctrine of "deterrence" ["sderzhivaniye"] or "intimidation" ["ustrasheniye"] preached in the United States merely spurs on the arms race that may sooner or later get out of control. There is still time to prevent that. The moratorium on nuclear tests could be the departure point to a secure future for mankind if the United States finally recognizes the futility and dangerousness of pursuing nuclear superiority.

The Soviet Union will not hold matters up. The proposal for a meeting between the USSR and the U.S. leaders in any European state's capital or in Hiroshima to reach an understanding on the cessation of nuclear explosions and on banning nuclear tests remains in force. Just as the Soviet people's will to prevent a thermonuclear conflagration on earth remains indestructible.

/9716
CSO: 5200/1403

STOCKHOLM PAPER CITES SOVIET AIDES ON NORDIC NFZ

PM181331 Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER in Swedish 16 Apr 86 p 8

[Harald Hamrin dispatch: "Soviet Union Would Not Withdraw Nuclear Arms"]

[Text] Moscow--The Soviet Union is not prepared at the present time to reach any decision on the question of the total withdrawal of all its nuclear-armed forces in the Baltic in the event of the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the Nordic area. This question can only be resolved in the context of negotiations involving all "interested parties."

So declared a representative of the Soviet Foreign Ministry at a press conference for Swedish journalists in connection with Prime Minister Ingvar Carlsson's visit to Moscow.

The Soviet Union has previously declared that it is prepared to discuss the possibility of giving the Baltic nuclear-free status in connection with the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the Nordic area.

Asked whether this means that the Soviet Union is prepared to withdraw all its nuclear-equipped vessels from the Baltic and also agree to a ban on the passage of such vessels into and out of the Baltic, Yevgeniy Rymko, deputy chief of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Scandinavian Department, declared that "this must be the object of discussions with interested parties." Asked whether he here meant--in addition to the Soviet Union and the Nordic countries--the other Baltic states of Poland, and East and West Germany, Rymko said that the "concept of 'interested states' refers to a wider circle."

At the same time the Soviet Foreign Ministry's official press spokesman, Vladimir Lomeyko, made it clear that the Soviet Union's position on the zone issue, despite speculation to the contrary, has not changed. The Soviet Union is willing to give multilateral or unilateral guarantees to the states forming part of a zone. The Soviet Union is also willing to discuss measures to be taken on its own territory which would facilitate the creation of such a zone. And finally the Soviet Union is willing to discuss the status of the Baltic.

Rymko said that no negotiations on a Nordic zone have begun and that it is therefore not possible to specify the Soviet position on individual questions of detail.

On the sensitive question of the drawing of a demarcation line in the Baltic, Rymko was also unwilling to go into any detail, this time pointing out that negotiations are in progress between the Soviet Union and Sweden.

"But the delegations to the negotiations are trying to find a mutually acceptable solution," he said.

Otherwise both Rymko and Lomeyko spoke in generally positive terms about Swedish foreign and neutrality policy.

"It is our hope and conviction that Prime Minister Carlsson's visit will give new impetus to a broadening and deepening of bilateral relations and mutual confidence," Lomeyko said.

He also repeated past declarations to the effect that the Soviet Union "respects Sweden's independence and territorial integrity" and that Swedish foreign policy "is an important factor for stability in the Nordic area and the whole of Europe."

/9716
CSO: 5200/1403

BRIEFS

TASS ON FRENCH MURUROA TEST--London May 31 TASS--France conducted the fourth and this year's most powerful underground nuclear explosion at Mururoa Atoll in the southern Pacific on Friday. According to reports from Wellington (New Zealand), the yield of the explosion was about twenty kilotons. The French authorities do not cease nuclear tests, exposing the ocean flora and fauna to a great risk of radioactive contamination, despite strong protests by the countries of the Pacific Ocean region and by the entire peace-loving public of the world. This was already the 79th nuclear explosion at Mururoa Atoll since June 1975. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 0918 GMT 31 May 86 LD]

/9716
CSO: 5200/1403

USSR: EUROPEAN ASPECT OF INF, CW, SDI, NFZ, MBFR ISSUES

AU300701 Moscow MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN in Russian No 5, May 1986 (signed to press 22 Apr 86) pp 103-113

[Article by A. Vtorov and Yu. Karelov: "Dynamism of the USSR European Policy" -- uppercase passages published in boldface]

[Excerpts] By working out the strategy for building the foundations of comprehensive international security, the 27th CPSU Congress has also made a qualitatively new contribution to the concept of the USSR's European policy. Boldly and thoroughly analyzing the nature of fundamental changes in the development of the contemporary world that is by no means the same as it was 30 or 40 years ago, the congress pointed out the objective need for new thinking and innovative approaches to urgent world problems. This reinterpretation of the entire complex of contemporary international relations also fully applies to Europe.

The CPSU Central Committee Political Report to the congress notes: "The CPSU considers one of the basic sectors of its foreign policy to be the EUROPEAN ONE. Europe's historic opportunity, and its future, lies in peaceful cooperation between states of that continent. It is important, while preserving the capital that has been built up, to move forward from the initial phase of detente to a more stable, mature detente, and then to the creation of reliable security on the basis of the Helsinki process and radical cuts in nuclear and conventional weapons."

Is such progress possible? Yes, the task set by the CPSU is not an easy one. However, it is based on the careful and precise consideration and analysis of all factors of European politics, that is, political, military, economic, social, and economic factors. Some of them have been determining Europe's political fate for a long time already, whereas some others have begun to fully manifest themselves relatively recently.

FIRST FACTOR. Today the situation in Europe is influenced more than ever before by the dynamism of the economic and political development of the countries of the socialist community. The socialist part of the continent is one of the most rapidly developing regions of the world. CEMA already accounts for approximately one-third of the world's industrial production.

The Europe of socialism not only demonstrates the possibilities of the socialist way of life but, essentially, it also ensures the continent's political stability, including its territorial-political structure, and provides the main guarantee against the threat of war. The determination of the socialist countries, united within the Warsaw Pact Organization, to safeguard the achievements of socialism in the Western sector and ensure the inviolability of their borders, established within the international legal system, is immutable.

SECOND FACTOR. In the existing configuration of interimperialist contradictions, Western Europe is one of the main centers of contemporary imperialism side by side with the United States and Japan. The region's proportional share in the industrial production of developed capitalist countries graphically attests to its potential, a share that has never been less than 40 percent in recent decades; and the rates of economic growth of West European countries as a whole are at the same level as those of the United States. West European countries have virtually reached the level of the United States in the volume of foreign investments and here and there they are even beginning to press the United States out of the American domestic market by successfully promoting their goods and services with American consumers in the automobile, ferrous metallurgy, textile, and footwear industries. The West Europeans are making serious efforts to prevent the United States and Japan from outstripping them in such important areas as information science [informatika], nuclear energy, and space.

The Americans, on their part, try to the maximum extent to "drain" out of Western Europe all the scientific-technological information that is of interest to them and to coerce the West Europeans -- as is the case in the question of participation in the Strategic Defense Initiative -- into one-sided orientation toward the United States. All this is done despite the existence in Western Europe of such an alternative as broad international cooperation in the peaceful exploitation of space. Western Europe is compelled to constantly feel the political, financial, and economic pressure from the United States that tries to use its military superiority and its supremacy in NATO for this purpose. This, in the final analysis, leads to the rise of new contradictions between them.

It goes without saying that it would be unrealistic not to see how closely interwoven the economic, military-political, ideological, and, first and foremost, class interests of the ruling circles in Western Europe and the United States have become. At the same time, however, the considerations of competitive struggle with American capital, including the struggle in markets of third countries, objectively and more and more insistently place before Western Europe the question of its role in the contemporary world. When "the heat is on," the leaders of West European countries know how to act from autonomous positions and do not allow any infringements of national interests. This also applies to the questions of cooperation between the West European countries and the Soviet Union. Another thing is also important. Having experienced the horrors and devastations of two world wars virtually during the lifetime of a single generation, Western Europe undoubtedly knows better than the United States how to value peace.

THIRD FACTOR. Europe was the first to make a start in recoiling from the "cold war" and move toward developing cooperation between states with different social systems. More than 10 years ago at the Helsinki forum, which was an unprecedented event in European history, 33 European states, together with the United States and Canada, adopted a jointly elaborated long-term program of ensuring stable peace and establishing equal and mutually beneficial cooperation on the scale of the entire continent.

And, no matter how equivocal the development of the process -- called the Helsinki process -- may have been, and no matter what difficulties may have been encountered on its path, there is no doubt that its positive elements outbalance and more than outbalance all other elements. It is no accident that all participants of the all-European conference advocate (possibly with different degrees of sincerity) the continuation of the Helsinki process.

It is no accident by any means that detente has grown the deepest roots precisely in Europe. It is here where a unique experience of coexistence and cooperation between states with different social systems has been accumulated. Both positive and negative conclusions should be drawn from this experience. Detente has brought about great positive changes in the mutual relations between all European states and has forced the militarist forces to make some concessions. At the same time, the detente of the sixties and seventies did not manage to work out an effective mechanism to restrain the the arms race. The detenté of that time -- and this was its main shortcoming -- was, first and foremost, political and economic and not military. It unfortunately could not impede the growing military confrontation in Europe and prevent a new wave of international tension provoked by such extremely negative circumstances for all Europeans as the deployment of American nuclear missiles in some West European countries, the missiles that were moved directly to the borders of the socialist community.

This is why ridding Europe of the nuclear missile burden that is beyond its strength has become a task of paramount importance. To accomplish this task it will be necessary to renounce many existing stereotypes of thinking. It is, however, important not to lose even a single grain of positive experience and to know how to draw correct conclusions, including conclusions drawn from the mistakes that have indisputably been permitted along the difficult road of the formation of detente.

FOURTH FACTOR. Contemporary Europe is multifaceted, full of contradictions and antagonistic tendencies. Its social development has been affected in full, if not also in greater measure, by the experience of all consequences of the great social changes of the 20th century, that is, the political changes and the changes connected with the scientific-technological revolution. At the same time, it is doubtful whether in any other region of the earth the new economic, political, and scientific-technological factors, both internal and external, have tied together the fate of different peoples and of the entire continent in such a tight knot as has been the case in Europe. The hard demands, that is, the foreign political demands and the demands of economic and social action capability and of spiritual form of society, which life itself now makes, are addressed in European conditions not only to each individual state but also to Europe as a whole.

And finally, the FIFTH FACTOR. What is involved in this connection are the level of intellectual development and the distinctive cultural-historical conditions of the formation of public opinion in West European countries, including the ruling class. It goes without saying that this phenomenon is not unequivocal but the rich school of European political life with its pragmatism and traditions of tolerance and common sense must be taken into account. This objectively enhances the susceptibility of a considerable section of public opinion in Western Europe, including also to a certain extent the opinion of representatives of the West European leading elite, to new phenomena and processes and makes it possible for this opinion in a number of cases to show a broader intellectual approach than the opinion on the other side of the ocean.

A considerable part of the Soviet proposals, outlined in the statement by M.S. Gorbachev on 15 January this year and incorporated in the international program of the 27th CPSU Congress, is directly addressed to Europe. Acting as the initiator of a sharp turn toward improving the general international situation, the Soviet Union proceeds from the assumption that Europe can fulfill a special mission, the mission of a new structure of detente.

In Europe the practical ways of implementing this idea lead through a maximum utilization of the positive capital accumulated in the course of development of the Helsinki process. It is characteristic that the principled foundations of the comprehensive system of international security proposed by the Soviet Union apply to four spheres, that is, the military, political, economic, and humanitarian spheres, something that corresponds to the main sections of the Final Act. This document also represents in the contemporary situation an unsurpassed model of new thinking and of nonstandard approaches to the most difficult political problems.

The 27th congress formulated the thesis of a principled importance concerning Europe's possibility for transition to a further and more stable stage of detente, the MATURE DETENTE that would be organically interconnected with building reliable security on the continent and with radically reducing nuclear and conventional weapons. Success in this colossal undertaking (and it is all of Europe and not only its socialist part that is interested in it) cannot be secured by relying on confrontation but on dialogue and mutual understanding. This will undoubtedly require a rejection of the existing stereotypes, including, first and foremost, those concerning the totality of the MILITARY-POLITICAL FACTORS that determine the nature of relations between East and West. It is first and foremost the question of the place of military force in the conduct of contemporary foreign policy, especially in European affairs, that requires a new interpretation. The world, and even more Europe, has become too fragile for the policy of force.

At the same time, both the American and the NATO military concepts continue to be based on the dangerous calculations of possible use of military force as a means of intimidation for the purpose of achieving political goals.

It unfortunately must be noted that the leadership of the United States and its main NATO allies is still held captive by impaired military-political concepts and continues to strive for an objectively unattainable goal of achieving for itself military-strategic superiority over the USSR and its allies.

Soviet foreign policy and military political approaches are determined by different concepts. As was stressed by the 27th congress, the orientation of Soviet military doctrine is unequivocally defensive. Proceeding from new approaches that break the customary logic of the arms race, the Soviet Union has proposed carrying out a complete liquidation of the Soviet and American medium-range missiles in Europe, including both ballistic and cruise missiles. The Soviet Union's goodwill manifests itself with full force in this aspect of our proposals. Our side has taken such a difficult step for us as that of not taking into account the French and British nuclear forces during the first stage of the Soviet plan of complete liquidation of nuclear weapons under the condition, completely naturally, that France and Britain refrain from qualitatively increasing their forces and the United States from transferring its missiles to other countries.

If this Soviet proposal, which was tabled at the Soviet-American negotiations in Geneva some months ago already, were adopted, a change of principled importance would be introduced in the life of the European Continent, one of the key zones of world security: The terrible spiral of the arms race would be broken and a start would be made in moving away from confrontation and toward peaceful cooperation. No less important is another thing. The solution to the question of medium-range missiles, proposed by the Soviet Union, ensures the possibility of achieving a corresponding agreement in a very short time.

The Soviet proposals take into account to the maximum extent both the political and military realities of Europe and the considerations of West European leaders. Now, it would seem, one small thing is lacking, that is, concrete work to work out the text of an accord. As it is said, goodwill is needed. However, the impression is now that it is precisely goodwill that is lacking in the West.

The United States and some of its influential NATO allies have chosen a different road, the road of burdening the solution of the problem of medium-range missiles in Europe with all kinds of conditions and linkages. The earlier "zero" option of the United States has once again been dragged out, according to which France and Britain -- the latter with U.S. support -- could continue to increase and modernize their nuclear missile armaments whereas the Soviet Union must destroy its medium-range missiles not only in Europe but also in Asia. In this connection one can only be amazed at the extent to which some West European representatives have suddenly begun to worry about Asian security clearly to the detriment of their own security.

Achieving an accord on ridding Europe of medium-range missiles is by no means made any easier by the attempts to drown this problem in a wider context of conventional armaments, chemical weapons, and tactical missiles, each of which, of course, represents an important problem that has to be solved but which are tied into a single big knot with the obvious aim of solving nothing.

The question is completely justified: Have not the United States and its closest NATO allies fallen back on the Soviet-American accord reached at the highest level concerning the acceleration of preparations for an agreement on medium-range missiles? Is not their true goal to preserve by any means the American first-strike missiles in Europe?

There are enough signals on this account to put one on guard. Among them is the "warning" by General B. Rogers, commander-in-chief of the NATO Joint Armed Forces in Europe, that the removal of medium-range missiles from Europe would "put a hole" in the U.S. defense "umbrella" over Western Europe. Among them are also the voices, heard especially on the banks of the Rhine, about the "indispensable role" of American missiles as a military-strategic tie between the United States and Western Europe which is clearly preferred to a prospective reduction of nuclear confrontation on the continent.

Moreover, influential Western newspapers already frankly write that the "zero" option proposed by the Americans in 1980 was aimed at taking the heat out of the antiwar and antimissile movement in Western Europe. It turns out that they did not even dream about reducing missiles to a "zero" level.

The same goal to misinform European public opinion and mislead the leadership of "wavering" allies (there were also some of these) was served by the claim that the deployment of American missiles in Western Europe was allegedly needed because of the appearance of the Soviet SS-20 missiles. The Governments of Britain, Belgium, Italy, The Netherlands, and the FRG most unceremoniously used this argument in striving to obtain their parliaments' consent to the deployment of American missiles on their national territories. It is now clear to everyone that the promise made by the American leadership at that time to ratify the Soviet-American SALT II treaty if the U.S. NATO allies agreed to accept American missiles in their countries has also turned out to be a deception.

Something else also has to be noted. The so-called "missile" decision of the NATO Council on 12 December 1979 already made the bloc's needs for medium-range nuclear weapons dependent on the "limitation of the increase of Soviet power." The decisions of the parliaments of Britain, the FRG, Italy, Belgium, and the Netherlands on the deployment of missiles in their territories also provided for the possibility for their revision in the event of a change in the military strategic situation as compared with the situation in December 1979. The readiness of the Soviet Union to completely liquidate all its medium-range missiles deployed in Europe (under the condition, of course, that the United States takes analogous countersteps) precisely creates a qualitatively new situation concerning the medium-range missiles in Europe. Moreover, as M.S. Gorbachev pointed out in his speech in the city of Tolyatti on 8 April this year, we propose precisely to destroy the reduced missiles and not to transfer them anywhere else.

This situation is now in many ways even more favorable from the viewpoint of the reduction of nuclear confrontation in Europe than the situation that existed at the time of the adoption of the NATO "two-track" decision in December 1979. For, if the Soviet proposals were implemented, there would immediately be several hundred fewer missiles and over 1,000 fewer corresponding charges on the European Continent.

We also add to this the Soviet side's unilateral removal from combat-ready duty all those SS-20 missiles -- including the dismantling of fixed installations for them -- that had been additionally deployed in Europe in response to the installation of American missiles there. If the American medium-range missiles were completely liquidated in Europe, there would also be no need to have the Soviet operational-tactical missiles in the regions where they had been deployed in their time in response to the appearance of American medium-range missiles in Europe.

These are the real facts and they are naturally well known both to the U.S. leadership and to the governments of those West European countries where American missiles continue to be deployed. However, they are in no hurry to take any reciprocal steps.

Moreover, in response to all the goodwill displayed by the Soviet Union, the installation of Pershing and cruise missiles continues and not one gesture has been made, even if only a symbolic one, that would indicate any desire to reach an agreement. It would be difficult to assess this line as anything else but short-sighted, confined by purely class and selfish considerations, and contrary to the interests of the peoples of Europe. This policy has no future.

Those who decline the solutions concerning some types of armaments by referring to other types of armaments have to be reminded that a complete liquidation of chemical weapons, one of the most dangerous and barbaric means of mass destruction, by the end of the century represents a component part of the Soviet disarmament plan put forward in the statement of 15 January this year. Europe has to play its role in this respect. The Soviet Union proposes to NATO countries -- without any procrastinations or invented "difficulties" -- reaching an accord on completely ridding the European Continent of chemical weapons. As one of the first steps in this connection, it supports the GDR's and CSSR's proposal to immediately set up a zone in central Europe that would be free of these weapons and the proposal of the People's Republic of Bulgaria and the Socialist Republic of Romania to establish a similar zone in the Balkans.

In his speech at the 11th SED Congress in Berlin on 18 April 1986 M.S. Gorbachev made major new proposals concerning conventional weapons. The USSR proposes reaching an agreement on a considerable reduction of all components of ground forces and tactical air forces of European states as well as of those of the United States and Canada that are deployed in Europe. The whole of Europe, stretching from the Atlantic to the Urals, should logically represent the geographical zone of the reduction. Being oriented to fundamentally improving the situation on the European Continent, these initiatives deprive the champions of intensified confrontation in Europe of their favorite argument that the removal of nuclear missile weapons would allegedly leave Western Europe almost defenseless in the face of the USSR's military superiority in conventional weapons. As is the case in many other respects, this established stereotype of NATO propaganda is very far removed from the real state of affairs. It is based on deliberately discounting one's own potential in conventional weapons which has considerably increased in the recent period. Simultaneously with the commissioning for line duty of new more precise and powerful models of military equipment such as tanks, other armored vehicles, artillery, and Air Force equipment, the number of other precision destructive types of weapons such as guided missiles and bombs, "vacuum bombs," means for distance-laid mining, and so forth has also increased.

The NATO operational-strategic concept is also evolving toward an even greater aggressiveness. The "Rogers Plan," adopted by NATO, is aimed at moving from the concept of "defense at forward positions" to the doctrine of preventive strikes against the forces of the Warsaw Pact countries in the entire depth of their operational-strategic formation. On the whole, the so-called conventional weapons of West European countries serve as an essential supplement to the NATO nuclear potential and represent a serious destabilizing factor.

The detailed draft treaty on initial reduction by the Soviet Union and the United States of ground forces and arms with subsequent nonincrease in the levels of armed forces and arms by the sides and the related measures in central Europe that was submitted at the Vienna talks as early as February of this year represented weighty confirmation of the readiness of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries for concrete measures in the cause of the reduction of conventional arms and armed forces. The initiative of the Warsaw Pact states takes into account those elements of the position of Western participants that seem acceptable.

It has to be especially emphasized that the Soviet side proposes reinforcing all practical arms limitation and disarmament measures with reliable verification [kontrol] and inspection [proverka]. As has already been stated more than once, and stated in this connection also at the highest level, the Soviet Union is no less interested in this than other countries.

The implementation of the recent new initiative of the socialist countries for the formation of nuclear-free zones in Northern Europe and the Balkans as well as for the formation of a corridor free of battlefield nuclear weapons in central Europe would represent an important step on the path of ensuring security for the peoples of the European Continent. If other European states and the United States and Canada positively respond to this initiative and agree to begin the corresponding concrete work, this would undoubtedly represent a serious contribution to ridding Europe of the nuclear threat.

The question of the effect on European security of the U.S. plans for the creation [sozdaniye] of the "Strategic Defense Initiative" or its other variety, "the European Defense Initiative," nurtured by certain West European circles, deserves separate attention. Considered from a purely military viewpoint, the illusory nature of the attempts to ensure any, in the least effective defense against ballistic missiles by means of an antimissile "shield" is now becoming increasingly obvious. According to the admissions by prominent military specialists and major scientists, such a "defense" is all the more unattainable in relation to the European Continent because of the extreme variety of the types of delivery vehicles for nuclear weapons concentrated in Europe.

As is known, these vehicles include not only hundreds of medium-range missiles but also a large number of delivery vehicles for tactical nuclear weapons, delivery vehicles for battlefield nuclear weapons, aviation, that is, the vehicles that in general cannot be the object of interception by space-based ABM echelons. There obviously are gounds for the doubts of those Europeans who believe that the real intention of American strategists is -- as it has surfaced already more than once -- to try under the conditions of a crisis situation to cover the United States with a "shield" against a strike and assign to Europe the role of the main theater of military operations.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it believes that achieving a serious lowering of the level of confrontation in Europe is a completely realistic task. This would undoubtedly reduce in many respects the general world tension and would represent a contribution of Europeans to accomplishing the general task of beginning to curtail the arms race and strengthening peace and trust between peoples.

It is an instrument that has already been created with the joint efforts of Europeans, the Helsinki Final Act, that once again comes to the fore in considering the other major aspect, that is, the POLITICAL aspect of creating a reliable security system in Europe. The core of the Final Act is the 10 well-known principles, the entire meaning of which consists of commitments for the benefit of peace, detente, and building interstate relations on the solid foundation of peaceful coexistence.

The Soviet Union constantly demonstrates its attitude in favor of serious constructive work in all aspects of the Helsinki process and of achieving concrete results in all talks conducted within its framework, be it the forthcoming all-European forum in Vienna, the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures, Security and Cooperation in Europe, or the Bern conference of experts of CSCE participant-states on the questions of contacts between people, institutions, and organizations.

The Soviet side will spare no efforts to ensure that these meetings are not set off against one another but are used as common links in the development of detente. The statement of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee on 15 January 1986 formulated a whole series of measures designed to seriously advance the work of the Stockholm conference and facilitate its agreement on the accords that would erect a barrier against the use of force or covert preparations for war on land, at sea, or in the air.

As is known, the USSR has expressed its readiness to eliminate the main difficulty from the work of the conference and agree now on notifications about major exercises by ground and Air Forces whereas the question of naval activities would be transferred to the next stage. This creates a real possibility to speed up the work of the Stockholm conference with a view to concluding its first stage with the adoption of a concluding document. Such a document, incorporating the concrete application and maximum effectiveness of the principle of nonuse of force side by side with a definite set of confidence measures in the military sphere, could be submitted to the Vienna meeting of CSCE participant-states. However, for the time being the NATO countries are not showing an equally responsible approach to the need for organizing constructive work in Stockholm. Their striving to evade the beginning of concrete work in drafting a concluding document is hardly in accord with the demands of times.

Striving to add to the significance of the next meeting of representatives of the CSCE participant-states which will begin its work in Vienna this fall, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries proposed at the March session of the Warsaw Pact Foreign Ministers Committee to open that meeting at the level of ministers of foreign affairs.

/9716
CSO: 5200/1402

SOVIET ACADEMICIAN INTERVIEWED ON CLIMATIC EFFECTS OF NUCLEAR WAR

Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 29 Mar 86 p 3

[Interview with academician Kirill Yakovlevich Kondratyev, USSR State Prize winner by Zh. Manilova: "The Earth's Climate and the Nuclear Threat"; time and place not specified]

[Text] Recently overseas, especially in the U. S., publications have appeared, whose sponsors, scientists, conclude, based on highly approximate modeling of physical and chemical processes in the atmosphere, that in the event that nuclear war is unleashed environmental conditions on earth "will be rather completely restored in 25 years." In this regard, an article by the "father" of the American hydrogen bomb, E. Teller, a scholar of extremely reactionary views, entitled "Terrible Myths About Nuclear Weapons," is extremely remarkable. Some American specialists have even taken upon themselves the right to assert that the rapid destruction of hundreds of millions of people during a nuclear war does not mean the end of civilization. It will be possible, they say, to sit in shelters on the edges of the continents and, finally, in the Southern Hemisphere, far from the fields of major nuclear battles.

Of course, neither Soviet scholars, nor those foreign specialists who honestly and objectively assess the possible consequences of nuclear war, can agree with such irresponsible conclusions. In their research they rely not only on data from numerical modeling, but also, most importantly, on data from direct observations. A group of Leningrad scholars has, for example, the results of observations of various phenomena in the atmosphere in 1958-1962 and data on weather and climate changes in the Northern Hemisphere during that period, the period of most intensive nuclear weapons tests. What conclusions did the scholars reach? Our discussion with the leader of these efforts, Academician K. Ya. Kondratyev, USSR State Prize winner, began with this question.

[Answer] Most uncomfortable ones. The consequences in the case of nuclear war will be expressed not only in monstrous destruction and deadly radioactivity, but also in a global ecological catastrophe, which will lead to the impossibility of life on earth.

The fact is that past wars left their marks only on that part of the land where they were waged, and virtually did not touch the atmosphere and the world's oceans. The consequences of nuclear weapons will affect all of the environment. Changes in the chemical composition of the upper layers of the atmosphere, with which is associated the tremendous danger of "Star Wars" plans, will be especially important.

As is known, the atmosphere surrounding our planet was formed during a process of long geological evolution. Its present chemical composition is, to a large extent, the result of interaction with the biosphere. And, although the atmosphere consists primarily of nitrogen and oxygen, it also has optically active components, in very small quantities, including water vapor, carbon dioxide, nitrous oxide, hydrocarbons, etc. It is precisely their presence which determines the very high sensitivity of the atmosphere to outside influences, for example, to the pollution of its carbon dioxide by industrial wastes.

[Question] Some time ago much was also written about the fatal impact on the ozone layer of the atmosphere from exhaust products of supersonic aircraft...

[Answer] A critically important role for life on earth is played by the presence of ozone in the atmosphere at altitudes of 10-50 km, which protects everything living on the planet from the fatal influence of the harsh ultraviolet radiation of the sun (ozone completely absorbs it). It is true that quite recently the opinion existed that the exhaust products of supersonic aircraft were doing irreparable harm to the ozone shield. But, then it became clear that these assessments were erroneous and greatly exaggerated. Research on the influence of exhaust products, and in particular of nitrous oxide, on the ozone layer played, however, an important role in the sense that they created the basis for assessing the possible influence of atmospheric nuclear explosions on the ozone. Calculations show that if the aggregate yield is approximately 10,000 megatons (according to expert data this is approximately half of the nuclear weapons now stockpiled in the world), the high temperature will lead to the breaking up of nitrogen molecules into atoms and the formation of a large quantity of its oxides.

Assessments which have been made indicate that a nuclear war of such a scale (which is more likely an underestimation than an overestimation) threatens virtually the total destruction of the ozone layer in the Northern Hemisphere and reduction of the overall amount of ozone in the Southern Hemisphere by more than 50 percent.

There is no need to explain the ecological catastrophe of such an effect on the biosphere, all the more so in that the destruction of the ozone shield will be accompanied by radioactive contamination, which will rapidly become global in scale. The formation of regions extending thousands of kilometers with especially high radioactivity is possible. In particular, the entire European Continent could become such a "hot spot."

[Question] Kirill Yakovlevich, I know that in recent years you have been deeply involved in such aspects of the consequences of nuclear war as climate.

Your reports at international symposia and articles in journals... I know, also, that your conclusions are derived not only from numerical modeling data, but also from direct investigations of the atmosphere. What are these conclusions?

[Answer] Apparently you are familiar with the term "nuclear winter?" This idea originated in 1982, when professors (P. Kruttsen) from the FRG and (D. Birs) from the U. S. published an article which disclosed one more aspect of the impact of massive nuclear explosions -- the throwing into the atmosphere of tremendous quantities of sooty aerosol and other compounds. Due to incinerating thermal radiation, nuclear explosions will cause gigantic fires in cities, forests and oil and gas fields, which will blaze for months. Therefore, a tremendous amount of aerosol will get into the atmosphere, which will reduce the entry of solar radiation. For example, at noon in the summer it will be reduced 150-fold, and a large part of the Northern Hemisphere will be plunged into darkness for an extended period of time.

The catastrophic decline of illumination will make impossible the natural growth of agricultural crops over extensive territories, and fires will destroy tremendous areas of cropland and forest ranges. Poor illumination will also have fatal consequences on aquatic vegetation. Phytoplankton and zooplankton, the basic food of the animal world in the seas and oceans, will perish.

Thus, the concept of "nuclear winter," which Soviet scholars are also studying, stems from the fact of intensive pollution of the atmosphere with sooty aerosol. The latter will not only reduce the illumination of the planet, but will also lead to substantial cooling, by several tens of degrees according to some calculations.

What can I say, the prospects are themselves terrible. However, recent research by Soviet and foreign scholars makes it possible to introduce still more burdensome refinements to the concept of "nuclear winter." The fact is, that following nuclear explosions in the areas of their greatest concentration an intensification of the "hothouse effect" may take place, as the result of pollution of the atmosphere with carbon dioxide. A situation will arise similar to that on Venus.

[Question] Truly. There almost no solar radiation reaches the planet, and the temperature on its surface is high due to the "hothouse effect."

[Answer] Yes, but on earth in the case of a nuclear war, the "hothouse effect" will not turn out to be long-lived, due to complex atmospheric processes. Very soon, specialists say, cooling of the earth's surface and the lower layers of the atmosphere will begin. Sharp climatic fluctuations may be repeated even further. The cause of such catastrophic instability of the climate, or, as is already being written in the specialized literature, climatic chaos, will be complex gaseous changes in the atmosphere, most of all, a great increase in the concentration of nitrogen dioxide and the destruction of the ozone shield. The conclusions of our atmospheric research after the nuclear tests of the late 1950's and early 1960's indicate this in particular.

In short, contemporary scientific data indicate indisputably that nuclear conflict will lead mankind to an ecological catastrophe. This final act in the life of mankind may begin with the devastation of the Northern Hemisphere, and conclude with a global climatic collapse. This conclusion was based not only on data from numerical modeling, but, I emphasize again, from analysis of direct observations. It fundamentally contradicts the opinion of those scientists in the West who believe that the influence of nuclear war is limited to the troposphere and lower stratosphere. This point of view justifies the assertion by advocates of "star wars" in the U. S. that nuclear explosions at great altitudes are not especially dangerous. But it is precisely there that nuclear explosions most change the gaseous composition of the earth's atmosphere, which is very dangerous from an ecological standpoint. Therefore, a particularly scientific approach to the analysis of the consequences of nuclear war indicates completely unambiguously the need to halt the arms race and ban and completely destroy nuclear weapons.

9069
CSO: 5200/1346

RELATED ISSUES

CANADA: PEACE ACTIVISTS LOBBY CLARK AT NATO CONFERENCE

Ottawa THE CITIZEN in English 29 May 86 p A4

[Text] HALIFAX (CP) — Peace activists are using this week's NATO meeting here as a chance to air their concerns face-to-face with the people who shape alliance policy.

A 10-member delegation from the Atlantic Peace Coalition met Wednesday in a heavily-guarded downtown hotel with External Affairs Minister Joe Clark, who had just arrived for the NATO conference.

The coalition represents thousands of Canadians from 44 social policy groups based in eastern Canada, including the P.E.I. Island Peace Council and Lawyers for Social Responsibility.

The coalition had only about 30 minutes to cover a variety of issues at the closed-door meeting — the use of Halifax harbor by vessels and submarines with nuclear capability and possibly bearing nuclear weapons, and NATO flight testing over Labrador.

Afterward, coalition spokesman Muriel Duckworth was blunt about what they achieved. "I think we got responses that were quite predictable. I can't put my finger on anything that was particularly encouraging to us."

But the coalition may have scored a point on the question of nuclear subs in Halifax harbor. "I think in the end (Clark) saw that this was an unsafe place for them to come and he said he would look into that question," Duckworth said.

Clark, in a visible hurry to attend another function, admitted to reporters that he and the delegation differed on a number of points, but said the meeting was a valuable one.

Duckworth said they reminded Clark that coalition members are his constituents. "We are your support group," they told him. "And if your objective in the world is to make peace in the world through our external affairs, we should be supporting you and you should be supporting us."

They also told the minister Canada should not always echo the American position in NATO.

"We wish that he would recognize that disunity on some very basic questions is valid," Duckworth said, adding that Clark seems to believe Canada cannot hope to influence the U.S. if it publicly opposes its policies.

Marian Kerans, another delegation member, said she's "rather pessimistic about the government's positions but I really do hope that we have had some influence."

Kerans said she thinks the group impressed upon Clark that many Canadians are worried about the country's role in NATO, "and I think that startled him."

The peace coalition believes Canada's role in NATO should be thrown open to debate, because the alliance's original goal of peacemaking has given way to promoting military strength.

Halifax, a city where deep military roots and loyalist traditions tend to keep a lid on public demonstrations of any kind, may be in for a change this week.

In an ambitious try for a mass protest, the coalition hopes to martial more than 1,000 people tonight for a rally on the grassed South Commons park in the middle of the city. They plan to march, holding candles, to the convention centre where the NATO talks are being held, and then on to the park where activists are staging a two-day peace vigil.

/0274
CSO: 5220/41

CANADA: POLL SHOWS MAJORITY REJECTS MILITARY NEUTRALITY

Ottawa THE CITIZEN in English 26 May 86 p A3

[Text]

More than half of Canadians are against a proposal to withdraw from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and cancel joint defence agreements with the United States, the Gallup Poll reported today.

In a survey of more than 1,000 Canadians conducted in April, the national public opinion institute found only 26 per cent favored a policy of neutrality, while 56 per cent disagreed. A decade ago when the question was asked, 57 per cent disagreed.

The survey also found that Canadians of English origin disagreed more with the proposal (64 per cent) than French Canadians (44 per cent) or those of ethnic origin (53 per cent).

The question Gallup asked was: *Some commentators have suggested that Canada withdraw from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), cancel its joint defence agreement with the United States, and adopt a policy of neutrality. Would you agree or disagree with this proposal?*

	AGREE	DISAGREE	NO OPINION
NATIONAL	26%	56%	18%
Mother Tongue Today:			
English	23	64	13
French	30	44	26
Other	27	53	20
Age Today:			
18 to 29 years	33	49	18
30 to 49 years	23	61	16
50 years and over	22	59	19

(A sample of this size is accurate within a four-percentage-point margin, 19 in 20 times)

/9274
CSO: 5220/41

RELATED ISSUES

CANADA: LABRADOR NATIVES AGAINST GOOSE BAY EXPANSION

Toronto THE TORONTO STAR in English 29 May 86 p A8

[Article by Val Sears]

[Text]

HALIFAX — While the NATO powers plot here to hold the Soviet Union at bay, Anne Mark, 9, and her brother Steve, 10, will be on the street pleading for the alliance to get off their backs.

The Marks, with their parents, Helen and Matthew, are Inuit whose primitive life in the wilds of Labrador is being destroyed, they claim, by NATO fighter planes zooming over their hunting grounds.

Their march against the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is sponored by a collection of peace groups that were to hold hold a candlelight vigil tonight against everything military.

It is a bit embarrassing for the Canadian delegation to the two-day meeting of foreign ministers from NATO countries, which was to open here today.

1,000 jobs

The Canadians are anxious to sell the NATO high command on expanding the fighter training base in Goose Bay.

If Canada beats out its only competition, Turkey, up to 1,000 jobs will be created in hard-pressed Labrador.

But the Inuit claim that the low-flying planes already there roar over their trap lines and caribou herds, frightening everyone to death.

Inuk David Nuke, here to protest the base, said it is "not good for my people and it is not good for Canadians.

"Those planes are destroying my culture. It is cultural genocide."

The planned $93 million upgrading of the base would add hundreds more flights a day.

Apinam Ispatau, a hunter in the region, told environmental researchers that "I was cleaning a marten one time when the aircraft flew over. The noise almost knocked me out. The jets went over 16 times."

But both NATO, which loves the huge forest — it looks a lot like the Soviet Union — and local businessmen are not worried about the few aboriginal people who live there.

While External Affairs Minister Joe Clark has agreed to hear the Inuit protest, it is unlikely that the rest of the NATO foreign ministers here will be aware of the Mark family.

Behind a wall of Mounties and security people, the 16 ministers will be busy with the issues of arms control, terrorism and chemical weapons.

NATO Secretary-General Lord Carrington told an opening news conference yesterday that it was clear the United States was losing patience with Soviet breaches of the SALT II arms-limitation treaty.

Washington has threatened to add more cruise missiles than the treaty allows if the Soviets continue to break the treaty terms.

"I can truthfully say the United States has been very patient on Soviet non-compliance," Lord Carrington said. "Now it is challenging the Soviet Union to do something about it."

He said that while East-West issues were vital, there would be much talk of "West-West issues as well."

Canada, for example, is anxious to use this opportunity to talk to U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz about tariffs on red cedar shingles, and to the Spanish foreign minister, Francisco Ferdandez Ordonez, about Spanish fishing vessels trespassing in Canadian waters.

/9274
CSO: 5220/41

END

JPRS-TAC-86-050

25 JUNE 1986

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

JPRS-TAC-86-050
25 JUNE 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT
ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

Soviet General on U.S. Claims, Real Motives for SDI
(Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 3 Jun 86)..... 1

Soviet May-June Reports on U.S. Debate Over SDI
(Moscow TASS, various dates; Moscow PRAVDA, 5 Jun 86)..... 4

Pressure on Congressmen 4
White House Confirms Intentions 4
NASA 'Increasing Military Bias' 5
Reagan 'Lies' in Funding Message 6
Abrahamson Seeks More Funding 7

Japan Moving Toward SDI Involvement
(Moscow PRAVDA, 15 Apr 86)..... 8

French 'Cohabitation' Showing Strains Over SDI
(Moscow in French to France and Belgium, 31 May 86)..... 10

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

UK Group in USSR Discusses Gorbachev Arms Cuts Proposal
(Various sources, various dates)..... 12

Delegation Members 12
Meeting With Gorbachev 13
Talks With Voss 13
Whitelaw Comments, Whitelaw Interview 14
Arms Deal Ruled Out, by Chris Moncrieff 15

Labour MP Lamond Interviewed 16
Received by Gromyko 18
Discuss Disarmament 18
Talks Continue 19
Dobrynin Receives Healey 21

SALT-START ISSUES

USSR: 4 June Press Conference on Reagan SALT II Decision
(Various sources, 5, 6 Jun 86)..... 22

PRAVDA Report 22
IZVESTIYA Report 24
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Report 28

Moscow Talk Show on U.S.-European Strains
(Moscow Domestic Service, 8 Jun 86)..... 34

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

TASS: CSSR Delegate Addresses MBFR Session
(Moscow TASS, 30 May 86)..... 40

IZVESTIYA Sees Potential for 'Successful' CDE Conclusion
(Moscow IZVESTIYA, 27, 29 May 86)..... 41

Correspondent's Dispatch 41
Foreign Ministry Spokesman 43

FRG Papers View Gorbachev's East Berlin Speech
(Various sources, various dates)..... 44

Proposals Said To Aim at Post-Reagan Era, Editorial, by Karl-Heinz Baum 44
Proposals Called Primarily 'Propaganda', Editorial, by Fritz Ullrich Fack 45
Lothar Ruehl's Analysis, by Lothar Ruehl 47
Proposals Seen Aimed at Soviet Bureaucracy, by Christoph Bertram 50

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

Lown Message Hails Test Moratorium Extension
(Moscow PRAVDA, 18 May 86)..... 55

USSR: Physicians Against Nuclear War Congress Urges Test Ban
(Various sources, various dates)..... 56

Gorbachev Message 56
Lown, Rau Addresses 56
Lessons of Chernobyl 58

Appeal to U.S., USSR 59
Press Conference 61
USSR's Chazov Interviewed 61

TASS Interviews U.S. Protestor at Nevada Test Site
(Moscow TASS, 21 May 86)..... 63

RELATED ISSUES

TASS: Possibility of Winning War Guides U.S. Strategy
(Moscow TASS, 4 Jun 86)..... 64

CPSU's Vorotnikov on U.S. Response to Soviet Initiatives
(Moscow PRAVDA, 29 May 86)..... 66

Further on Naval Discussion at UN Disarmament Commission
(Moscow TASS, 20 May 86)..... 69

TASS: UN Disarmament Head Holds Press Conference in Moscow
(Moscow TASS, 26 May 86)..... 71

TASS on Proposed UN Conference on Disarmament, Development
(Moscow TASS, 3 Jun 86)..... 73

USSR Hosts Scientists Conference Against Nuclear War
(Various sources, 27-29 May 86)..... 75

Fedoseyev Preview 75
Fedoseyev Addresses Group 77
Academy President on Issues 77
Velikhov on Limited War, SDI 78
Dobrynin Conference Report 78
Forum Appeals to World Scientists 83
Conference Ends 84

Japanese Foreign Minister Discusses Security Issues in Moscow
(Moscow TASS, 30 May 86; Moscow PRAVDA, 1, 2 Jun 86)..... 85

Gorbachev on INF, SDI 85
Shevardnadze, Abe Speeches 86
PRAVDA Carries Joint Communique 88

Soviet Army Paper Addresses Asian Security Issues
(Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 5 Jun 86)..... 90

Gorbachev Writes Preface to Speech Anthology Published in UK
(Moscow World Service, 6 Jun 86)..... 93

PRAVDA Reviews UK MP's Visit, NATO CW Plans
(Moscow PRAVDA, 1 Jun 86)..... 95

Soviet Talk Show: Asian Security, INF, SALT, Test Ban, CW
(Moscow Domestic Service, 1 Jun 86)..... 97

Briefs
Soviet-Bulgarian Consultations 102
Architects Against Nuclear War 102

/6539

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET GENERAL ON U.S. CLAIMS, REAL MOTIVES FOR SDI

PM050836 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Jun 86 Second Edition p 3

[Candidate of Military Sciences Major General F. Gontar (Reserve) article under the rubric "United States -- Citadel of Reaction and Militarism": "Washington's Nuclear Ambitions"]

[Text] Many foreign political and public organizations and sober-minded statesmen and politicians in the West have perceived the Soviet Union's extension of its unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests through 6 August this year as an exceptionally important, constructive initiative.

At the same time, the nuclear explosions being carried out one after another in Nevada (United States) appear particularly sinister against the background of the goodwill displayed by the USSR. They are designed, in particular, to perfect nuclear devices under the "star wars" program.

We recently saw the 3d anniversary of the U.S. President's announcement of that program, disguised as the "Strategic Defense Initiative." The groundless claims that it was conceived for purely defensive purposes have been exposed even by many Western specialists, including American ones, as a gross deception of naive people. In fact, it is a question, above all, of the creation [sozdaniye] of space-strike arms for offensive, aggressive purposes. It is planned to cram space with combat means such as rapid-fire electromagnetic guns, satellites with small-sized homing subprojectiles, nuclear explosive devices of very different types, and others. They are designed both to hit targets in space and to make strikes against ground, sea, and air targets.

This question occurs to people unversed in politics: Why is the U.S. Administration clinging so stubbornly to its SDI and accelerating its implementation? There are two main reasons for this. The first is the desire at all costs to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union. As is known, all previous attempts have failed. Space has now been chosen as the arena of confrontation, where Washington entertains the illusion that it will forge ahead and overtake the USSR by relying on the most modern technology. The second reason is the insatiable appetite of the U.S. military-industrial complex, which reckons on making fabulous profits out of the arms race. This is why, contrary to common sense and in defiance of protests from the world public, including the American public, fulfillment of the "star wars" program is not only not being curtailed but is continuing on an ever increasing scale -- which threatens mankind with unpredictable consequences.

As M.S. Gorbachev declared, the accident at Chernobyl once again brought to light what an abyss will open up if nuclear war befalls mankind; the stockpiled nuclear arsenals are fraught with thousands upon thousands of disasters far more terrible than that at Chernobyl. The nuclear age imperiously demands a new approach to international relations and the pooling of efforts by states with different social systems in the name of ending the pernicious arms race and radically improving the world political climate.

However, the U.S. ruling circles are moving in the diametrically opposite direction. This is convincingly shown by the President's decision, announced on 27 May, not to continue observing the Soviet-American legal and contractual documents on limiting strategic offensive arms and also by the American Administration's desire to strive at all costs to realize its nuclear space ambitions.

In order to conceal the sinister nature of this program the U.S. mass media are throwing caution to the wind, as the saying goes. To start with, they promoted the fairy tale that this program is of a "nonnuclear" nature and will render nuclear weapons "unnecessary" and "useless." But then reports came to light (it proved impossible to conceal them) that the space-strike arms will include x-ray lasers powered by explosions of special nuclear devices. Then supporters of SDI began claiming that x-ray lasers pumped by nuclear explosions are not so dangerous since they comprise just one of several components of space-based weapons.

In reality, the fact that the "star wars" program provides for the creation [sozdaniye] of not only a space x-ray laser but also a number of other so-called "third-generation" nuclear devises which could be used in strike arms is carefully concealed from the American public. According to data cited in the American press, the "third-generation" nuclear charge devices now being developed [razrabatyvat] in the interests of the "star wars" program include the following:

Nuclear explosive devices that create a directed stream of a large number of destructive elements. Moving at hypersonic velocities, they are capable of destroying various targets owing to their high kinetic energy:

Nuclear devices which on exploding form a directed high-energy electromagnetic pulse. They are designed to knock out radioelectronic, radio communications, computers, and other equipment and to blind the enemy's system of early detection and warning of a nuclear missile attack for the purpose of ensuring a surprise strike against him; and thwarting or weakening a counterstrike against U.S. territory;

Nuclear devices that generate directed beams of high-energy particles (electrons, protons, neutral atoms);

Nuclear devices whose explosive energy is used to pump gamma lasers (grasers) and high-energy lasers operating in the visible wave band. The nature of their destructive effect on various targets is approximately the same as for x-ray lasers.

It is also an important fact that the design concepts of "third-generation" nuclear charge devices are verified precisely in the underground nuclear tests on the range in Nevada. At least 10 nuclear test explosions have already been carried out there for this purpose (as well as for the creation [sozdaniye] of x-ray laser).

It is precisely the U.S. ruling group's desire to fulfill at all costs the program for the development [razrabotka] of "third-generation" nuclear weapons designed for waging "star wars" that is the chief reason for its stubborn reluctance to subscribe to the Soviet moratorium on all nuclear explosions. By carrying out a 21 May the 11th officially announced explosion since the Soviet Union introduced its unilateral moratorium (and the 4th explosion this year), Washington once again demonstrated to the whole world its adherence to an unrestrained nuclear arms race.

Advocates of the "star wars" program claim that its nuclear aspects are on a "limited scale." At the same time, they maintain that the share of appropriations for research in the nuclear sphere in the overall SDI budget does not exceed 10-15 percent. However, the U.S. Energy Department plans first to spend $605 million on work on creating [sozdaniye] nuclear devices alone under the "star wars" program in fiscal 1987 alone. That is more than twice the expenditure for this purpose planned for the current fiscal year. In addition, it is proposed to meet part of the expenditure on space nuclear means at the expense of the Pentagon, to which it is proposed to allocate $4.8 billion for the SDI program in fiscal 1987. It is also planned to double the appropriations for conducting nuclear tests on the Nevada range. Second, according to the data of American specialists, the cost of nuclear weapons in the existing nuclear missile systems does not usually exceed 10 percent of the cost of their carriers and the backup technical facilities. Therefore, the fact that up to 15 percent of the total appropriations on the "star wars" program are being allocated to the nuclear aspects of this program certainly does not indicate any kind of "limited" nature of these aspects.

In an attempt to belittle the danger of deploying nuclear devices in space, champions of the "star wars' program also claim that these devices "can be ground-based" and will be launched into space, they say, "only if necessary." As even American specialists admit, this is no way lessons the danger of a nuclear conflict being unleashed.

As we see, the arguments being cited as proof of the "limited" scale of the nuclear aspects of SDI -- arguments designed to reduce the wave of mass actions against the militarization of space -- are false from beginning to end.

/9716
CSO: 5200/1406

SOVIET MAY-JUNE REPORTS ON U.S. DEBATE OVER SDI

Pressure on Congressmen

LD162224 Moscow TASS in English 1513 GMT 16 May 86

[Text] Washington, May 16 TASS--The Reagan administration is building up its pressure on U.S. congressmen to win their support for stepping up work to implement the space militarization programme. Speaking before members of a special arms control group of a U.S. House of Representatives subcommittee, Allen Holmes, assistant secretary of state, intimated that the administration would implement the "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI) aimed at developing strike space weapons, whatever the cost. He called on legislators to do their utmost to ensure full-scale financing of SDI programmes.

Despite the previous claims by U.S. leaders that the "space shield" would allegedly be "non-nuclear", the assistant state secretary put it flatly that the development of arms based on nuclear energy sources was an important sphere of explorations within the SDI framework. Resorting again to concoctions about a "Soviet military threat", A. Holmes intimated that the administration resolutely opposed any bill limiting work in this sphere. He used the same trick to substantiate the "need" for deploying the U.S. anti-sacellite system (ASAT). On a moratorium on nuclear tests for which the USSR insistently calls on the USA, the State Department representative said at first that the complete and universal prohibition of nuclear tests remained the long-term aid of the USA, but added at once that the USA could not agree to the moratorium.

White House Confirms Intentions

LD232144 Moscow TASS in English 2125 GMT 23 May 86

[Text] Washington, May 23 TASS--The White House confirmed today that the United States intends to continue at a high pace the effort to implement the so-called Strategic Defence Initiative aimed at the creation of star wars armaments. The President's spokesman stated that the administration strongly disagrees with the 46 senators who demanded, in a letter to the head of the White House, a sharp cut in the appropriations for SDI. Expressing irritation over such a demand, the spokesman made it plain that the White House and the Pentagon expect the Congress to meet in the biggest possible volume the administration's request. The spokesman recalled that 4.8 billion dollars was asked for the Strategic Defence Initiative for the 1987 fiscal year.

NASA 'Increasing Military Bias'

LD231027 Moscow TASS in English 0952 GMT 23 May 86

[Text] Washington, May 23 TASS--TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko reports:

On Thursday the U.S. National Space Commission issued a report on U.S. resources in space research and on the main directions of space research in the coming fifty years. The publication of the report had been planned for the beginning of April but was postponed on the insistence of the White House in view of the work of the commission for inquiry into the circumstances of the space shuttle Challenger disaster.

The report paints a radiant picture according to which U.S. space shuttles will make journeys to Mars and back as early as the beginning of the 21st century. Like ocean liners they will have on board everything necessary for long space flights. The report maintains that they will be spacious enough to provide passengers with comfort for the period of long space travels. The report also has it that a space port will be created in a near-earth orbit as early as the end of the nineties of the current century, and that man will again land on the Moon by the year 2005.

Only the future will show whether such plans and possibilities are destined to come true. In the meantime it can be pointed out that many in the United States have long been assailed with growing doubts as to whether the country will be able to make rapid and successful headway in the most complex cause of space research and peaceful uses of outer space. U.S. space programmes have an increasing military bias, as a result of which NASA programmes aimed at using outer space for peaceful purposes shrink more and more. At present already a half of NASA programmes are intended to carry out the Pentagon's assignments.

The dominance of military departments in NASA programmes will also inevitably increase as the costly "Ostar wars" programme aimed at deploying strike weapon systems in outer space will get implemented. The Pentagon puts tough pressure on NASA, pressing for the maximum acceleration of the realisation of the planned military program. It is precisely this circumstance that is known to have resulted in the space shuttle Challenger disaster, because technical defects were overlooked owing to haste. In the opinion of U.S. specialists and the press, the space shuttle Challenger disaster threw U.S. space programmes several years backwards. In such situation the Pentagon will undoubtedly increase pressure on NASA for the purpose of making it speed up the work to a still greater extent, which may result in new disasters. The authors of the report obviously proceed from ideal conditions, without taking all these circumstances into account.

Reagan 'Lies' in Funding Message

PM051116 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jun 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Above an Abyss in Lies. Reagan's Message to Congress on the Military Budget"]

[Text] Washington, 4 Jun — The U.S. Administration has embarked on a new round of twisting the arms of U.S. legislators. President Reagan has sent Congress a message demanding full support for the administration's budget request for fiscal 1987 to implement America's "strategic modernization" programs, including the "Strategic Defense Initiative." The administration demanded that Congress appropriate the unprecedented sum of $320 billion for these programs.

During the preliminary vote in Congress, as is known, the Senate cut the administration's request to $301 billion, and the House of Representative to $285 billion. However, as the message shows, the administration does not intend to reconcile itself even to such insignificant cuts in relation to the sum total of military spending requested.

In order to push the demands for the Pentagon's requests to be met in full through the House-Senate Conference Committee and then through Congress as a whole, the White House has once again resorted to shameless juggling with facts and to overt lies.

Lie number one. It has long been well known to everyone that the United States itself has been the initiator of the arms race ever since the short-lived U.S. monopoly of atomic weapons. But the message claims that the United States is implementing the "strategic modernization" program because it is allegedly lagging behind the Soviet Union in terms of many parameters of the military arsenal. In fact, Washington is obsessed by a desire to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union and to get its hands on a potential to inflict a preemptive first strike, as indicated both by the buildup of strategic offensive arms on the earth and by the accelerated development [razrabotka] of space arms systems under the "star wars" program.

Lie number two. The President's message expresses the administration's firm determination to implement at an accelerated pace both the "star wars" program and all other military programs, and all this is proclaimed as..."ensuring greater security for the world."

Lie number three. Those people in the United States who advocate slowing down the rate of increase in military spending are virtually branded as enemies of America. "Every dollar deducted from our strategic programs," the message states, "is a victory for a potential aggressor. Each reduction and delay weakens our position at Geneva."

In the opinion of a number of observers here, such false claims and accusations long ago became irksome to many legislators. This is indicated, in particular, by the fact that on the day the President's message was published, 46 senators of both the Democratic and the Republican Parties confirmed their resolute opposition to the "star wars" program and demanded a sharp cut in the appropriations on its implemenation.

Abrahamson Seeks More Funding

LD050612 Moscow TASS in English 0459 GMT 5 Jun 86

[Text] Washington June 5 TASS -- The U.S. Adminstration would not give up its attempts to mislead public opinion about the "star wars" programme. This is illustrated by a statement made by the SDI Chief, General Abrahamson, to the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives. He said that the fulfilment of SDI would contribute to stability in relations among countries and strengthen security. Arguing for larger appropriations for his organization, the general again invoked the "Soviet military threat" myth and portrayed the "star wars" programme as a means of countering "aggression." Abrahamson made it clear that the appropriations were needed to speed up work on all the components of the partially space-based ABM system, including strike systems.

/9716
CSO: 5200/1406

JAPAN MOVING TOWARD SDI INVOLVEMENT

PM211820 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Apr 86 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent Yu. Vdovin dispatch under the general heading: "Washington Steps Up Pressure on Tokyo"]

[Text] Tokyo, 14 Apr--A third delegation of experts from leading companies and high-ranking leaders of a number of ministries has returned to Japan from a trip around the United States. Its task was to fully establish the prospects for Japanese participation in the American "star wars" program. The delegation will submit its recommendations to the Government in the next few days.

Tokyo officialdom is still pretending that it has not yet finally determined its attitude to Washington's venture. However, much evidence has already accumulated indicating that the Japanese Government is ready to play an active part in SDI. It only remains to be stated what form this will take, whether it will be at the level of government or private companies.

Having expressed at the beginning of last year his "understanding and support" for the "Strategic Defense Initiative," Prime Minister Y. Nakasone has spent all this time preparing public opinion to swallow the bitter pill of Japanese involvement in this dangerous American venture. The preparation was needed to circumvent the constitutional provisions which repudiate war and armaments, Japan's three nonnuclear principles--to which the premier has repeatedly sworn his devotion in public--and parliamentary resolutions limiting space research and exploration to peaceful purposes only and prohibiting the export of weapons and military technology.

With each day that passes members of the Government here have made increasingly clear references in their speeches to the fact that all these restrictions may be sacrificed to the military alliance with the United States, "to strengthening solidarity with the West," to participation in "technological progress," and so forth. The three Japanese delegations' trips to the United States were specifically designed to determine the forms and scale of SDI participation most favorable to Japan. The question is not a simple one, since in certain spheres Japan possesses as much scientific research and technological potential capable of being used in SDI as the United States. It is no secret that the Japanese monopolies would like to obtain certain guarantees that their interests will be taken account of when the orders are shared out.

But even after the pill has been sweetened by several months of government efforts and promises of various kinds of "advantages," involvement in "star wars" still causes the Japanese public grave concern. Misgivings about the wisdom of such a move are even being voiced in the ruling circles. The democratic forces and the press warn that this step could have the most serious consequences. Participation in SDI, according to MAINICHI, may lead to increasing pressure on the part of the United States to make Japan accept even greater military commitments.

/9716
CSO: 5200/1406

FRENCH 'COHABITATION' SHOWING STRAINS OVER SDI

LD312104 Moscow in French to France and Belgium 1730 GMT 31 May 86

[Boris Tumanov commentary]

[Text] Good evening, dear listeners. The disadvantages of cohabitation were evident recently, but this time in an area which goes far beyond the context of strictly French national problems. This time it is a matter of France's position with regard to the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative about which the French prime minister and president have expressed different points of view.

As everyone knows, Chirac lavished praise on SDI when he addressed the members of the French Diplomatic Press Association, and he declared, among other things, that he would not allow France to stay outside the great inevitable, irreversible and justified movement of the initiative in question. For him France cannot stay outside this great research work.

The word research here seems to be a formal clause, given that the French prime minister already approves of star wars on the military level, as he said.

As for President Mitterrand, he on the other hand asserted that his country would never take part in the U.S. plan for the militarization of space, nor would it allow itself to be dragged into a conflict in which it does not intend to take part. Speaking to students of the military school at Coetquidan, the president confirmed -- to use his own words -- the permanent doctrine, which has existed for nearly a quarter of a century now, and which must be kept.

He meant the doctrine of the autonomy of French defense, which goes back to the De Gaulle era.

So we are faced with a rather disconcerting fact: There are two different allegiences in the upper spheres of France on the subject of an important, or even vital, question -- vital not just for France and its future, but for all mankind. It would be naive to believe that for France to adopt the idea of star wars would just mean a change in military doctrine, for the militarization of space, envisaged by Washington, would create such a destabilization in world security that no military doctrine in the world could reestablish the balance of power that exists at the current time.

Those pushing SDI stress the irreversible nature of technological progress, as if the existence of this worldwide phenomenon could of itself justify an endless arms race. Of course, you cannot stop progress -- I am far from proposing the destruction of machines or preaching a return to the stone age. But man must not become the slave, nor even less the hostage, of his own inventions. The implementation of SDI would inevitably give rise to the creation of countermeasures, which, in turn, would provoke the appearance of other initiatives quite as mad, as the moon war or galactic war type. Where would it all end? In the yawning emptiness of a war that would leave no one on our earth. Do you not think, dear listeners, that that is too high a price to pay for the admiration of some for technological progress? We no longer live in the age of the Marne taxis, or of the Maginot Line, for heaven's sake! Hundreds of mini-atomic reactors, powerful laser guns suspended permanently above our heads is not like 1914. Come on, there is not much harmless tradition there, is there?

I am not speaking about all this to make a point about the difficulties of the current authorities in France, nor to give you my opinion about [word indistinct] which you have known for a long time. I am just asking you: If some French people voted for the present majority, does this mean automatically that they voted for the militarization of space? I should not think so. I should not think so at all, and first and foremost because I know that the French are not in the habit of picking up crumbs from other people's tables, even from the table of their great ally and benefactor.

/9716
CSO: 5200/1406

UK GROUP IN USSR DISCUSSES GORBACHEV ARMS CUTS PROPOSAL

Delegation Members

LD232035 Moscow TASS in English 2012 GMT 23 May 86

[Text] Moscow May 23 TASS -- A delegation of the British Parliament today arrived in Moscow for an official visit at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The delegation is headed by Deputy Prime Minister, Lord President of the Privy Council, member of the Conservative Party Viscount Whitelaw.

On the delegation are Shadow Foreign Secretary, Labourite Denis Healey; Chairman of the British Group of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, Conservative David Crouch; deputy leader of the opposition in the House of Lords, Labourite Lord Underhill; Deputy Chairman of the British-Soviet group of the House of Commons, Chairman of the select committee on social service, Labourite Rene Short; deputy leader of the Liberal Party and the party's spokesman on foreign affairs Alan Beith; member of the Conservative party Peter Temple-Morris; Chairman of the British-Soviet group of the House of Commons, Chairman of the Select Committee on Trade and Industry, Conservative Kenneth Warren; Secretary of the British-Soviet group of the House of Commons, Labourite James Lamond; Labourite Martin Flannery; member of the Executive Committee of the British group of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, Conservative Roger Sims; Chairman of the Parliamentary Labour Party Foreign And Commonwealth Committee, Labourite Tom Clarke; Conservative Robert Jackson; private parliamentary secretary to minister of state for foreign affairs, Conservative Tony Baldry.

The delegation was met at the airport by chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet Avgust Voss, deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet Georgiy Arbatov, Vladimir Terebilov, other officials.

Great Britain's Ambassador to the USSR Bryan George Cartledge was among the welcoming party.

Meeting With Gorbachev

LD261744 Moscow TASS in English 1731 GMT 26 May 86

[Text] Moscow May 26 TASS -- On May 26 Mikhail Gorbachev received in the Kremlin a British parliamentary delegation led by Lord Whitelaw and including representatives of all the parliamentary parties, among them the Labour "shadow" foreign secretary, Denis Healey.

Lord Whitelaw handed Mikhail Gorbachev a personal message from British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher.

In the course of a frank and friendly conversation, the sides presented their positions on a broad range of outstanding problems of the international situation and relations between the USSR and Britain.

Talks With Voss

LD271634 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1525 GMT 27 May 86

[Text] Moscow, 27 May (TASS) -- A meeting took place today in the USSR Supreme Soviet with the British parliamentary delegation led by Lord Whitelaw, lord president of the council

Avgust Voss, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, told the guests about basic trends in the social, economic, public, and political life of Soviet society at the current stage, and spoke about the activity and structure of the country's supreme organ of state power.

We greatly appreciated the opportunity to meet with Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and are deeply grateful to him for the time he gave us and for the exchange of opinions which took place, the head of the delegation said.

David Crouch, Renee Short, Robert Jackson, Tom Clarke, and Alan Beith, the delegation members, spoke about various aspects of the British Parliament's activity.

During the conversation, great attention was paid to the theme of international security and disarmament. Despite differing approaches to several issues concerning this problem of paramount importance to humanity, both sides agreed on the need for an end to the arms race.

The British MP's explained the various points of view of the parties which they represent on domestic and foreign policy issues. It was stated in particular that the Labour Party opposes British participation in the American SDI program, including its research section, and opposes the deployment of U.S. cruise missiles in the country. D. Healey described as a new and valuable initiative the proposal expressed by Mikhail Gorbachev during his meeting with the delegation that if Great Britain officially decides to eliminate its own nuclear weapons, the Soviet Union will be prepared to reduce its nuclear potential correspondingly.

The participants in the talks remarked that the exchange of opinions that took place made a positive contribution to the development of Soviet-British parliamentary links.

Taking part in the talks were deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet Georgiy Arbatov, Vadim Zagladin, Yuriy Izrael, Sergey Losev, and Vladimir Terebilov.

Lunch was provided in honor of the delegation on behalf of the chairmen of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The British members of Parliament visited the mausoleum of V.I. Lenin.

Whitelaw Comments

LD271753 Moscow World Service in English 1550 GMT 27 May 86

[Interview with UK parliamentary delegation leader Lord Whitelaw by Aleksandr Barabeychik in Moscow on 26 May; from the "Guest Speaker" program--recorded]

[Excerpt] Barabeychik] Lord Whitelaw, you have just been received by General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev in the Kremlin. How would you describe the meeting, what did you learn about the Soviet stand on major international problems?

[Whitelaw] The meeting was long and very friendly and conducted in a good spirit throughout. We discussed both those issues on which we agreed and those issues on which we differed, I think, in a very friendly spirit.

[Barabeychik] During the meeting did you feel the Soviet leader's concern for the present tense international situation?

[Whitelaw] Yes, indeed. They feel that they have made various proposals, they don't feel that in all cases they've had a sufficient response from the West. Obviously that's a matter on which we might argue but that is their feeling.

[Barabeychik] What remedies does he suggest for rectifying it to the better?

[Whitelaw] I think that Mr Gorbachev is very keen to have a summit meeting but he wants to be sure before he has such a meeting that there are positive areas where the groundwork has been done leading to an agreement.

[Barabeychik] Did Comrade Gorbachev familiarize you with the major Soviet peace initiative of 15 January?

[Whitelaw] Yes, indeed he did, and he hopes that that will be followed up and he feels that so far it hasn't been followed up as much as he would have liked.

[Barabeychik] Mikhail Gorbachev also dwelt on Soviet-British relations. What points did he make, how does he see the priorities here?

[Whitelaw] Well, he was grateful for the prime minister's letter. He said that it showed that the British Government wished to continue the dialogue. He hoped that that would be further developed. He would reply to it. He had some reservations as to the extent with which we had reacted to various events but on the whole he clearly wanted an improvement in British relations and he wanted to see the Soviet Union and Britain closer together on many of these issues. And that was the whole burden of a meeting which went on for so long, was conducted in such a friendly spirit. It showed the feeling that everyone wanted to make progress.

[Barabeychik] General Secretary Gorbachev's approach to subjects of your discussion, did it reveal new political concepts, new political thinking so vital in our nuclear age?

[Whitelaw] He had various proposals to make about the future of nuclear weapons, about a comprehensive test ban treaty which he wants to put to the other nations, and no doubt that will be done.

Arms Deal Ruled Out

LD271803 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1783 GMT 27 May 86

[By Chris Moncrieff, PA chief political correspondent]

[Text] Liberal Party Deputy Leader Mr Alan Beith, in Moscow with a group of British parliamentarians, today ruled out "deals on the side" between Britain and the Soviet Union as a means of reducing international tension over nuclear weapons.

Mr Beith was speaking after the all-party group had talks at the Kremlin with Mr Mikhail Gorbachev, in which the Soviet leader said Moscow was ready to strike a separate agreement with Britain on cutting nuclear weapons.

But Mr Beith said afterwards: "The answer to problems of international tension does not lie in deals on the side between Britain and the Soviet Union.

"Britain's role should lie in helping to bring about a more constructive response from the United States and in ceasing to back such U.S. policies as star wars."

Mr. Beith went on: "Mr Gorbachev is in a strong position to achieve a reduction in arms spending, which the Soviet economy badly needs, as part of an agreement which could safeguard the interests of the Western democracies and make the world a safer place.

"We made it absolutely clear that he is very keen to secure real progress in multilateral disarmament, and, although all the options he has put forward will require considerable further work, Western leaders will be very foolish if they do not show a positive response.

Mr Beith said. "Mr Gorbachev referred to the need to build a bridge from both sides. Mrs Thatcher needs to push the Americans into doing more bridge-building instead of encouraging them to carry on as before."

Mr Beith handed to Mr Gorbachev a letter from Mr David Steel in which the Liberal leader called for an improvement in "the controlled management of our differences".

Mr Steel's letter continued: "Irrespective of the United States action in Libya, from which we strongly dissented, or their failure to respond to the ban on test. [as received] which you offered and have now extended, it is essential that the Geneva process be taken forward.

"My own view is that the freeze option, which you have proposed, would represent a significant step forward. Quite evidently it is not a policy in itself, but it would greatly improve the possibility of longer-term agreement in terms which both the Soviet Union and the Western alliance would regard as providing security and stability."

Labour MP Lamond Interviewed

LD301859 Moscow World Service in English 1550 GMT 30 May 86

[From the "Guest Speaker" program, presented by Aleksandr Barabeychik]

[Text] [Barabeychik] Our guest today is James Lamond, a Labour Party MP who is on the list of the British Parliamentary delegation touring at present in the Soviet Union. The British delegation was received in the Kremlin by General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev. James Lamond had a few words of comment on this meeting:

[Begin recording] [Lamond] We had a very good meeting in the Kremlin with Mr Gorbachev. The whole delegation, all 14 of us, were present, and we were able to discuss the situation between our two countries; the very strong need for building bridges. But, as Mr Gorbachev said, a bridge cannot be built from one side only, and he outlined the proposals which the Soviet Union had made which are familiar to people through the speeches he has made, and he asked us to try and encourage our government and people to respond to the positive proposals. And we had an exchange of opinion about the response that we made to the very concrete proposals he had laid down on 15th January, in which Britain is involved to a small extent in as much as they [as heard] should not further develop their nuclear weaoons, which of course means that we shouldn't go ahead with the Trident missiles purchases. And that seems to me to be quite sensible because if the two superpowers are struggling to try and establish some level, some end to the arms race, for others including ourselves and France, to continue building our arms and developing and improving them would be counterproductive and quite contrary to the spirit of the negotiations between the superpowers. And it was on matters of this kind that we discussed for, as I say, about 2 hours. So it was, in my opinion, a very fruitful meeting. The delegation certainly felt that they had been honored and we will be making reports back of course, in my case all over the country because I have a string of meetings arranged for describing to interested peace activists what went on here. I shall go back refreshed and determined to carry on the struggle in my own country for peace.

[Barabeychik] Now, the center of gravity of Soviet foreign policy has always been the attainment of a situation when there is no nuclear armaments left on our globe, and in most clear cut and precise form this aspiration to that goal was expressed in 15th January statement by General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev, to abolish in three stages by the end of our millennium all nuclear weapons. Can you specify your stance on this document?

[Lamond] Well, of course, I support the document very strongly. I think it was one of the most positive, concrete proposals which had made before the whole world for many many years. And it lays the path open and clear towards that goal which I hope all politicians in all countries will share, because a world without nuclear weapons would certainly be a wonderful world, much safer than the one we have today. Of course, there have been responses from the West and I regret to say in the main negative responses, in particular in my own country where we play some part in the program towards nuclear, complete nuclear disarmament. It has been, the suggestion has been, rejected -- the suggestion that is that we should not improve our nuclear weapons in the meantime, because Mrs Thatcher has agreed again and again with the Americans that she should go ahead with the purchase of Trident missiles. So, I support the plan, and many many people in Britain also support it, including many members of Parliament. But there is a lot of work still to be done in our country before we can convince our leaders, our present leaders, that they should participate fully in this plan.

[Barabeychik] After the Chernobyl mishap the USSR once again deemed it necessary to extend its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions till 6th August, in an attempt to move the problem of nuclear testing away from the blind alley, and this is a very grave step on our side. [sentence as heard] Was it welcomed in the British Labour Party?

[Lamond] It was welcomed very much indeed, and we have been emphasizing again in our Parliament and at the meetings I have spoken at in connection with the International Year of Peace, by the time the 6th August comes round that will be 1 year in which the moratorium, the unilateral moratorium, has stood. And I feel that the Americans should respond to that. In particular, you yourself mentioned the incident at Chernobyl. I think this has brought home to people exactly the danger, not only from the explosions themselves -- because there must be some danger from that -- but from what a nuclear war would really mean. Because if an incident, a very serious incident but nevertheless a minor incident in comparison to what would happen in, let us say, a nuclear strike of any kind, a deliberate nuclear explosion in the atmosphere, a strike against the Soviet Union for example, would not affect only the Soviet Union but would have its very serious effects throughout the whole of Western Europe and perhaps the world. So, it has focussed people's attention to this matter and made the proposal by the Soviet Government all the more acceptable in the West, I think. [end recording]

[Barabeychik] I was talking today with James Lamond, a Labour MP who is now touring the Soviet Union with the British parliamentary delegation.

Received by Gromyko

LD021803 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 2 Jun 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Today in the Kremlin Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko received a British parliamentary delegation headed by Lord Whitelaw. The British parliamentarians' attention was drawn to the Soviet peace initiatives, the concept of universal security that was put forward at the 27th CPSU Congress, the program for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons before the end of the 20th century and the moratorium on nuclear tests up to 6 August of this year that the Soviet Union has announced unilaterally. These proposals meet the most treasured aspirations of the peoples in questions of war and peace, and in fact, in questions of life and death for all mankind.

Comrade Gromyko stressed that the actions of the U.S. Administration are directed towards undermining a Soviet-U.S. dialogue. President Reagan's intention to refuse to observe the provisions of the treaty on limiting strategic offensive armaments shows that he is continuing a policy that is not directed toward preventing a nuclear war.

Both sides expressed satisfaction with the positive moves towards bilateral cooperation that have been noted of late.

Lord Whitelaw expressed warm gratitude for the cordial welcome that had been given to the parliamentary delegation from Great Britain.

Discuss Disarmament

LD021812 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1730 GMT 2 Jun 86

[Text] A conversation between Andrey Gromyko, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the British parliamentary delegation, which is completing its visit to the USSR, took place in the Kremlin today.

The British parliamentarians attention was drawn to the Soviet peace initiatives and, in particular, to the proposals concerning nuclear disarmament that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev addressed to the Government of Great Britain. In response to this, the delegation's members described their great interest in these proposals. From their viewpoint, the Soviet leader's important proposals ought to be examined in London.

The chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium stated that it was necessary to achieve the implementation of the decisions jointly agreed upon that are aimed at consolidating peace and lowering the level of military confrontation in Europe. Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko described the activities of the highest bodies of state power in our country and, while responding to specific questions, dwelt on certain other foreign policy problems.

Talks Continue

LD021955 Moscow TASS in English 1950 GMT 2 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow June 6 TASS -- [dateline as received] British deputy prime minister, lord-president of the Privy Council, member of the Conservative Party, leader of the British parliamentary delegation Viscount Whitelaw said that the British MPs had been strongly impressed by great attention paid in the Soviet Union to the young generation and to cultural development.

This was said at the opening of the conversation in the Kremlin between member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet Andrey Gromyko and the British parliamentary delegation that is concluding its official visit to the Soviet Union.

Andrey Gromyko said that since the times Lenin was at the helm of the state, Soviet power has been paying the closest of attention to the education of youth. This has always been so, and this state of affairs continues. For instance, the latest meeting of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet discussed the work in the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic to observe the demands of the legislation for the consolidation of the family and enhancement of its responsibility for the upbringing of children.

At the same time, the state is doing everything to ensure that the masses of the people should have the opportunity to familiarize themselves with the cultural heritage of mankind. This helps educate the man who believes in the victory of reason over ignorance. All the measures aimed the molding of such man are imbued with ideas of peace and friendship among nations, of the need for averting the threat of nuclear catastrophe.

In reply to a statement of the British parliamentarians that they declare for mutual understanding between the two countries, Andrey Gromyko said that this is a very valuable remark, and that the Soviet side goes along with it.

During the conversation, the attention of the British parliamentarians was called to the Soviet peace initiatives of historic importance: the programme of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons before the end of the 20th century, advanced in Mikhail Gorbachev's statement of January 15, 1986 and confirmed by the 27th CPSU Congress, the concept of universal security set out in the Political Report to the Congress, the moratorium on nuclear testing that the Soviet Union announced unilaterally and that will be operating till August 6 of this year, the Soviet Union's readiness to start without delay any talks on a complete ban on nuclear weapon tests. These proposals meet the aspirations of peoples in questions of war and peace.

"Those who heap up nuclear arms are generating danger, not security", Andrey Gromyko said. "Moreover, they aggravate this danger to the utmost. This must not be forgotten by anyone ever".

"The Soviet Union is guided by deeply humane considerations when proclaiming the need for the elimination of nuclear arms", Andrey Gromyko said. "The main thing for which we call is to realize the tremendousness of this task, for without solving it all of us, that is, all countries, large and small, all peoples, will be as if looking down an abyss, facing the threat to fall into it".

One of the leaders of the opposition in the British parliament, member of the Labour Party, Denis Healey said that a few days had passed since the delegation's conversation with Mikhail Gorbachev. Prospects of a Soviet-U.S. summit were discussed during that conversation. But two important events took place since that time. The first of those events was that the United States opposed the entire international community in Berne at a conference on human contacts and thus frustrated the adoption of a final document. The second event was that President Reagan proclaimed the intention to give up this year the observance of the provisions of the treaty on the limitation of strategic offensive arms (SALT-2). In the opinion of the British MP, the prospects for a Soviet-U.S. dialogue cannot be viewed as promising in these conditions.

Gromyko noticed that such actions by the U.S. Administration resemble the planting of a high-explosive bomb under the SALT-2 treaty. Only those act this way who are not interested in averting a nuclear war, who feverishly pursue a dangerous policy aimed at continued production of nuclear armaments and outer space militarization. But the British Parliament could say its weighty word in support of the treaty. But it has not said it as yet.

The Soviet side furthermore stressed the importance of those proposals on nuclear disarmament, which were put forward by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev in the talk with the British MPs and were addressed to the British Government. In reply to this, the members of the delegation said what great interest those proposals evoked among them. They believe that the important proposals of the Soviet leader should be discussed in London.

The President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet said that the peoples throughout the world await practical steps on the part of governments, first and foremost, the governments of major countries. It is necessary that agreed decisions aimed at consolidating peace and reducing the level of military confrontation in Europe be put into effect. The Soviet Union will patiently and purposefully pursue the course of stepping up international cooperation and reaching agreements on important and acute international problems.

Alan Beith, deputy leader of the Liberal Party, said that he was greatly impressed by the fact that the 27th CPSU Congress paid much attention to youth as an important force in developing society. Deputies of the British Parliament, including David Crouch, Rene Short and Kenneth Warren put a number of questions pertaining to the Soviet Union's domestic and foreign policies, the activity of the USSR Supreme Soviet and its Presidium.

Gromyko answered all questions, told the British MPs about the activity of the higher bodies of state authority of our country, and in answering the respective questions, touched upon some other foreign policy problems. He underlined the role of the Soviet and British MPs who can and, in our view, should make a tangible contribution towards building confidence and developing mutually beneficial relations between the Soviet Union and Britain.

On behalf of the entire delegation, Viscount Whitelaw thanked the Soviet leadership and Soviet people for the cordial reception in the USSR.

Taking part in the talk from the Soviet side were - Avgust Voss, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Tengiz Menteshashvili, secretary of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Vasily Kazakov, Sergey Losev and Vladimir Terebilov -- deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Anatoliy Kovalyov, first deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, Nikolay Rubstov, head of the Secretariat of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and Vladimir Suslov, head of the Second European Department of the USSR Foreign Minstry; from the British side -- Bryan George Cartledge, British ambassador to the USSR.

The British MPs visited V.I. Lenin's study and living rooms in the Kremlin, now a museum.

In the evening, the delegation left for homeland. It was staying in the Soviet Union on an official visit at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Dobrynin Receives Healey

LD021813 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 2 Jun 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Comrade Dobrynin today received Healey, the UK Labour Party's shadow foreign secretary, who has been in Moscow as part of the UK parliamentary delegation. An exchange of opinions was held on problems of disarmament, as well as questions of bilateral relations between the CPSU and the British Labour Party.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1412

USSR: 4 JUNE PRESS CONFERENCE ON REAGAN SALT II DECISION

PRAVDA Report

PM051058 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jun 86 First Edition p 4

["At the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center"--PRAVDA headline]

[Text] A press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists was held at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center on 4 June. Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev, first deputy defense minister and chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff; and A.A. Bessmertnykh, USSR deputy foreign minister, participated in the press conference.

The following statement was read at the press conference: A few days ago the U.S. Administration took an action aimed at whipping up the arms race. President Reagan announced that in the future the United States will refuse to observe the 1972 Interim Agreement Limiting Offensive Strategic Arms [SALT I] and the 1979 SALT II agreement. This means that the incumbent U.S. leadership has embarked on a unilateral renunciation of commitments under the most important documents in international law, which the USSR and the United States have observed on a reciprocal basis. The step in question is a logical culmination of Washington's policy regarding SALT II, which began with the refusal to ratify the agreement.

An attempt has essentially been made to wreck the military parity between the USSR and the United States that is the basis for strategic stability in the world and to remove the existing material restrictions on the arms race. These actions are fraught with serious consequences for international security.

They have been condemned worldwide. Clearly realizing that the announced course runs counter to the fundamental interests of people, including the American people, leading figures in the U.S. Administration would like to obscure as far as possible the essence and purport of what they have done. To that end they are resorting to distortion of the true state of affairs, juggling with figures, and substituting concepts. The full force of the political disinformation machine has been brought into play.

However, the White House scenario, concocted to justify the motives and the underlying cause behind the measures being taken to destroy the foundation of the arms limitation and reduction process, does not stand up to comparison with the real facts.

Fact one. The United States, contrary to Washington's assertions, has in recent years done nothing aimed at promoting an "atmosphere of mutual restraint" in the strategic offensive arms limitation sphere. The present administration has not reduced or even downgraded [skorrektirovana v storonu organicheniya] a single arms program. On the contrary, in peacetime a comprehensive program has been worked out and set in motion for building powerful arms in all components of the U.S. strategic triad -- new ICBM's, new missile submarines, new bombers, and cruise missiles in all launch modalities. Essentially all the programs shelved by previous administrations for one reason or another have been reanimated. What kind of restraint can we be talking about when even World War II battleships are "demothballed" and reequipped as nuclear weapon platforms?

The United States has embarked on the implementation of the "star wars" program and the creation of space-strike arms. Now it wants to give a space dimension to the arms race. The United States has prepared for the production of new mass destruction weapons -- chemical binary weapons. Nor does the administration's stubborn reluctance to join in the existing Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions attest to restraint. In no way does Washington want to eschew nuclear explosions, which are carried out in order to create new types of weapons, including space weapons.

Fact two. It is not the Soviet Union, as the White House claims, but the United States that refuses to conduct serious talks in the arms limitation and reduction sphere.

The Soviet Union has put forward an integrated program for eliminating nuclear, chemical and other types of mass destriction weapons in the world. It has submitted proposals for conventional arms and armed forces reductions. At the talks on nuclear and space arms the USSR has proposed specific measures for implementing the first phase of a nuclear disarmament program -- agreeing to radical, 50 percent reductions in the relevant nuclear arms of the USSR and the United States and eliminating all Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in the European zone.

Has the United States made any new proposals at the talks recently? No, not a single new proposal has emerged from the United States.

Fact three. U.S. representatives, including the President, try to justify the decision to drop the interim agreement and SALT II by citing "Soviet violations" of these documents. They cite the appearance in the USSR of an alleged second new type of ICBM ICBM -- the SS-25 -- and the "excessive encryption" of telemetry information during missile test launches. In this context the construction of a radar station in Krasnoyarsk is also mentioned, although, let us note in passing, this radar station has nothing to do with SALT II.

There is no substantial foundation for any of these claims. The Soviet side has demonstrated more than once, on the basis of concrete data, that the United States is deliberately distorting facts and is diverting attention from its own violations of treaties and agreements. The more it talks about Soviet "violations" the more obvious this truth becomes.

Fact four. By renouncing observance of SALT I and SALT II, the U.S. Administration would also like to gain some political capital. While giving the impression that they will "technically" observe SALT II for another few months (until MIRVed strategic delivery vehicles exceed the limit of 1,320 units as a result of the deployment of bombers with cruise missiles), the Americans are declaring that they will, you see, observe the Soviet side's behavior throughout this period and "take it into account."

It is absurd to adopt this approach in any event, and especially now. Violators of treaties do not have the right to pose as their guardian. Moreover, you must not proclaim a treaty and an agreement "dead" and, at the same time, observe the, even "technically."

Washington's current course can be summed up as follows: If some U.S. military program conflicts with the existing treaty restrictions, the agreement will be discarded. Arms get priority. While basically doing nothing to achieve new accords in the arms limination sphere, the United States is breaking the treaties and agreements that have already been achieved.

This approach will do Washington no good either from the viewpoint of strengthening U.S. security or from the viewpoint of Soviet-U.S. relations or the development of the world situation as a whole.

As the Soviet Government statment says, the United States will not manage to acquire military advantages for itself at the expense of others' security. The Soviet Union will take the necessary practical steps to prevent strategic military parity from being undermined. The U.S. side should have no illusions on the score.

Answers were then to journalists' questions.

IZVESTIYA Report

PM051538 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Jun 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Melor Sturua report: "Exposure of Lies. In the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center"]

[Excerpts] Externally, everything looked at it did a few days ago. The same scene of action -- No 4 Zubovskiy Boulevard. The USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center. The same leading actors -- Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev, USSR first deputy defense minister and chief of General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, and A.A. Bessmertnykh, USSR deputy foreign minister. The same subject was discussed -- the situation concerning the SALT I and SALT II agreements. Yes, externally everything looked as it did a few days ago. But only externally. Between 23 May, the date of the first press conference, and 4 June, the date of the second, a third date was crudely sandwiched -- 27 May. On that day, which will no doubt go down as a black page in the history of international relations, U.S. President Ronald Reagan made a statement that the future the United States will refuse to observe the Soviet-U.S. legal treaty documents on the limitation of strategic offensive weapons. Something against which the Soviet Union has issued repeated warnings has happened.

...The curtain parted at about 1200 hours to reveal before the journalist who had assembled a graph chart of the basic limitation parameters of SALT I and SALT II. The same thing more or less happened a few days before. And yet, it was not quite the same. An alarming reminder of this was provided by a curt notice on the graph. It read: "All limitations lose their effect upon U.S. withdrawal from the SALT I and SALT II accords." In my report on the first press conference, I compared the graph with a cage in which the nuclear missile arms race was locked, as it were. I wrote that the Pentagon predator intends to break out of that cage. Even at that time the bars of this symbolic cage appeared thoroughly bent, and even sawn through here and there. Following the 27 May presidential statement, the cage is, for all intents and purpose, empty.

Recalling the essence of the U.S. President's statement and the subsequent Soviet Government statement, and seeing the curtian, that until then was covering the graph, being drawn aside, I thought: The opening of this symbolic curtain seems to mark the beginning of a new drama whose transatlantic producers have decided to disrupt military-strategic parity and gain advantage over us.

I spoke earlier about the external similarity between the two press confernces. In one respect, however, they were totally dissimilar. In the first instance, not a single one of the U.S. journalists representing bourgeiois news media at the press conference asked a single question of strategic arms limitation. This time there were more than enough of them. Reporters from NATO countries displayed equal "curiosity." It was no accident that the "dumb" began to speak. The anxiety caused by Washington's adventurist step loosened their tongues. Let us recall the outcome of the NATO meeting in the Canadian city of Halifax, where even the most loyal U.S. allies openly expressed their disagreement with Washington's provocative step. (Maybe the city's name -- Halifax -- reminded some people of British diplomat Lord Halifax, and his shadow, in its turn, about the policy of appeasement and its catastrophic consequences.) Be that as it may, there was a multitude of questions ...

The time for the question and answer session came. Most questions dealt with the exposure of Washington's attempt to shift blame from the guilty to the innocent to "justify" its own aggressive plans and schemes.

Question: What effect will Reagan's decision on U.S. nonobservance of the SALT agreements have on the talks on nuclear space weapons?

Answer: Definitely negative.

Taking into account the interconnection of the questions being discussed and resolved in Geneva, it is easy to foresee that an acute complication of the state of affairs in the strategic weapons group cannot fail to affect the overall situation at the talks.

Question: President Reagan says the United States will "display restraint" in the development [razvitiye] of its strategic offensive weapons. Is the USSR prepared to reciprocate?

Answer: Instead of a treaty drawn up on the basis of the principle of equality and identical security, the U.S. President is promising not to deploy more "strategic nuclear delivery systems" and "strategic ballistic missile warheads" -- that is, warheads on ICBM's and SLBM's only -- than the USSR.

As you can see, the U.S. President is not talking at all about equality in heavy bombers and ALCM's. He wants to have at least a triple advantage in them, without allowing the Soviet Union the right to compensate for them with ballistic missiles, which are our main strategic deterrent. Nor does he talk about SLCM's, of which the United States plans to have several thousand. He is also silent about his medium-range missiles in Europe, which are strategic weapons with regard to the USSR.

One wonders what kind of restraint we can be talking about if it is proposed that we do not increase the number of our arms but the U.S. side would increase its number by many thousands of units.

Question from an IZVESTIYA correspondent: President R. Reagan's statement again points out that the SS-25 missile, as the RS-12M missile is called in the West, is a second new type of ICBM banned under the SALT II Agreement. Is that so? If not, why is it so persistently repeated?

Answer: The Soviet Union has tested only one new type of ICBM -- the RS-22.

When they refer to the testing of a second new type of ICBM in the Soviet Union, the Americans have in mind the RS-12M missile which is a modernization of our old ICBM, the RS-12. This kind of modernization is not prohibited and was carried out in strict compliance with the provisions of the agreement.

In the United States the clear provision of the SALT II agreement on the list of elements which make up the so-called "throw weight" of a missile was deliberately distorted. At variance with this provision the weight of certain elements which make up the throw weight of the old missile (RS-12) (means to overcome ABM defense and the warhead guidance device) is not included, while on the other hand, the weight of equipment used only during testing is illegitimately included in the throw weight of the modernized ICBM (the RS-12M).

The aim is obvious. The United States already has one new type of ICBM (the MX missile). Now it is creating [sozdayut] another new type of ICBM (the Midgetman), which is at variance with the treaty. Hence stem the attempts to gain some kind of "right" to a second new type of ICBM and at the same time to slander the USSR as a partner in talks and to prepare the ground for the renunciation of the obligation to observe treaty provisions in the sphere of strategic arms limitation. In actual fact, there was no mention of the Soviet RS-12M missile when the United States was deciding about the Midgetman missile. The story about the "violation" in this part of the treaty appeared later, and one can understand why.

Question: What can you say about the encryption by the Soviet Union of telemetry information during ballistic missile tests:

Answer: The encryption of telemetry information transmitted from the missile is not banned by the SALT II agrrement. The Second Common Understanding to Point 3 of Article XV of the treaty says that "each party is free to use various methods of transmitting telemetric information during testing, including its encryption," except in cases when such encryption "impedes verification [kontrol] of compliance with the provisions of the treaty."

What are the treaty provisions in question? First and foremost, those relating to the definition of new types of ICBM's: type of propellant, number of stages, length, largest diameter, launch-weight and throw-weight of missiles, and the number of weight of warheads. They are defined in agreed statements to Article IV of the treaty.

We are strictly complying with all this. However, since the U.S. side raised the question of encryption, the Soviet side, in a gesture of constructive approach, expressed readiness to resolve it on a reciprocal basis. We proposed to identify and agree upon the parameters of telemetric information which, in the U.S. side's opinion, must not be encrypted.

But the U.S. side has stubbornly evaded solving its own question. It has become evident that the United States is not at all interested in solving this question but needs to retain it as part of its ammunition of groundless accusations aginst the USSR.

Question: A radar station is being built in the USSR, in the Krasnoyarsk region, which is perceived by the U.S. Administration as a violation of the ABM Treaty. On the other hand, the United States is deploying a major radar station in Greenland and intends to deploy a similar station in Britain, which is causing anxiety on the Soviet side.

Answer: We have repeatedly produced facts to prove the United States that the Krasnoyarsk radar station, currently at the construction stage, is not meant to perform any ABM functions. It is a tracking station for objects in space, both Soviet and American. This will become finally evident when the station begins transmitting [nachnet rabotot na izlucheniye].

Regarding the new and powerful U.S. phased array radar stations, one of which is being deployed in Thule (Greenland) with the second planned for construction at Fylingdales (Britain), they really are violations of the ABM Treaty. The U.S. side itself admits it is talking about early-warning stations against ballistic missile attacks. It is well known, however, that under the treaty such stations must be sited only along the periphery of each side's national territory. Of course, neither Greenland nor Britain are either peripheral to or on the territory of the United States. Despite the fact that here the United States is clearly acting contrary to the ABM Treaty and we could have insisted that the situation be corrected without any steps in response by our side, the Soviet side, in a good-will gesture, expresses readiness to seek a solution to the problem concerning the stations. For example, with a view to easing mutual anxiety, we transmitted such a proposal to the Americans at different levels. We would halt the completion of construction at the Krasnoyarsk radar station, while the Americans would dismantle their station in Greenland and would not build a similar station in Britain.

This proposal is staring at the Americans from the table. But the United States is clearly interested not so much in eliminating the problem as in retaining it. The reason is to exploit the Krasnoyarsk radar station issue for provocative political purposes.

Question: In your opinion, what effect could U.S. President Reagan's decision have on the planned Soviet-U.S. summit meeting?

Answer: The Soviet side has repeatedly outlined its concept of USSR-U.S. summit meetings.

The holding of such a meeting requires creation of the appropriate political atmosphere and reciprocal readiness to move toward and aim for specific practical accords, primarily on arms limitation and reduction questions.

The provocative actions taken by the United States regarding nonobservance of the 1972 SALT I and the SALT II agreements offer no proof at all of its willingness to participate in the creation of the proper atmosphere, let alone to move toward specific accords. Moreover, the present U.S. Administration has shown by these actions, coupled with others of which we have repeatedly and bluntly spoken to the U.S. side, that it favors a summit meeting in words, while in practice it is doing everything to thwart the possibility of such a meeting.

Question upon question... So many questions. Listening to them you have the clear feeling that Washington's provocative actions are causing concern to the world: a legitimate concern caused by international lawlessness and the further fueling of the nuclear missile arms race.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Report

PM051340 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Jun 86 Second Edition p 3

[Captain 2d Rank V. Kuzar and Captain 2d Rank Ye. Nikitin report: "Washington Is Undermining Strategic Stability. At the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center"]

[Text] "How do you assess the Washington administration's refusal to implement the SALT I AND SALT II accords from the viewpoint of U.S. military interests and the policy currently followed by the White House?"

Answering this question from KRASNAYA ZVEZDA's correspondent, Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev, USSR first deputy defense minister and chief of General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, declared at a press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists held in Moscow on 4 June that neither SALT I nor SALT II have had any practical effect on U.S. military interests. They have held Soviet military programs back more. In the time that has elapsed since, the United States has dismantled for replacement only 168 strategic delivery vehicles against the USSR's 540. Here it must be said that this refusal is of a political rather than a military nature.

It often happens in politics, press conference participant A.A. Bessmertnykh, USSR deputy foreign minister, said in amplification of the answer by Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev, that a single specific episode reveals the entire essence of a political course. This is exactly what has happened now. Washington's repudiation of the SALT I and SALT II accords, despite numerous statements that the United States wishes to rid itself of the burden of nuclear weapons, displays the U.S. Administration's political unwillingness to take specific steps to ease international tension and eliminate nuclear weapons. This action revealed the U.S. course toward building up the arms race and undermining strategic stability.

A.A. Bessmertnykh specifically devoted his press conference statement to questions of strategic arms limitation: [at this point the First Edition contains the additional sentence "A few days ago the U.S. Administration undertook an action aimed at whipping up the arms race."

President Reagan announced the United States will in the future refuse to observe in the future the 1972 Interim Agreement Limiting Offensive Strategic Arms (SALT I)[First Edition omits "SALT I"] and the 1979 Treaty on the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (SALT II) [First Edition omits "SALT II"]. This means that the incumbent U.S. leadership has embarked on a unilateral renunciation of a commitment under a most important document in international law, which the USSR and the United States have observed on the basis of reciprocity. [At this point the First Edition contains the additional sentence "The step in question is a logical culmination of Washington's policy regarding SALT II, which began with the refusal to ratify it."]

An attempt has essentially been made to wreck the military-strategic [First Edition has "military"] parity between the USSR and the United States that is the basis for strategic stability in the world [At this point the First Edition contains the additional phrase "and to remove the existing material restrictions on the arms race."]. These actions are fraught with serious consequences for international security and have been condemned worldwide. [The last sentence reads as follows in the First Edition: "for international security. (new paragraph) They have been"]

Realizing [First Edition has "Clearly realizing"] that the announced course runs counter to the fundamental interests of the people, including the American people, leading figures in the U.S. Administration would like to obscure as far as possible the essence and purport of what they have done. To that end they are resorting to distortion of the true state of affairs, [at this point the First Edition contains the additional phrase "juggling with figures, and substituting concepts. The"] and the full force of the political disinformation machine has been brought into play.

However, the White House scenario, concocted to justify the motives behind the measures being taken to destroy the foundation of the arms limitation and reduction process, does not stand up to comparison with the real facts.

Fact one. The United States, contrary to Washington's assertions, has in recent years done nothing aimed at promoting an "atmosphere of mutual restraint" in the strategic offensive arms limitation sphere. The present administration has not reduced or even downgraded [skorrektirovana v storonu ogranicheniya] a single military [First Edition has "arms" instead of "military"] program. On the contrary, in peacetime a comprehensive program has been worked out and is being implemented [First Edition has "set in motion" instead of "is being implemented:] for building powerful arms in all components of the U.S. strategic triad -- new ICBM's, [At this point the First Edition contains the additional word "new"] missile submarines, heavy [At this point the First Edition contains the additional word "new" and omits "heavy"] bombers, and cruise missiles in all launch modalities. [At this point the First Edition contains the additional sentence "Essentially all the programs shelved by previous administrations for one reason or another have been reanimated."] What kind of restraint can we be talking about when even World War II battleships are "demothballed" and reequipped as nuclear weapon platforms"

The United States has embarked on the implementation of the "star wars" program and the creation of space-strike arms. Now it wants to give a space dimension to the arms race. The United States has prepared for the production of new mass destruction weapons -- chemical binary weapons. Nor does the administration's stubborn reluctance to join in the existing Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions attest to restraint. In no way does Washington want to eschew nuclear explosions, which are carried out in order to create the latest types of weapons, including space weapons.

Fact two. It is not the Soviet Union, as the White House claims, but the United States that refuses to conduct serious talks in the arms limitation and reduction sphere.

The Soviet Union has put forward an integrated program for eliminating nuclear, chemical, and other types of mass destruction weapons in the world [the First Edition omits "in the world"]. It has submitted proposals for significant reductions in conventional arms and armed forces in Europe [First Edition has "for conventional arms and armed forces reductions"]. At the talks on nuclear and space arms the USSR has proposed specific measures for implementing the first phase of a nuclear disarmament program -- agreeing to radical, 50-percent reductions in the relevant nuclear arms of the USSR and the United States and eliminating all Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in the European zone.

Has the United States made any new proposals at the talks recently? No, not a single new proposal has emerged from the U.S. side.

Fact three. U.S. representatives, including the President, try to justify the decision to drop SALT I and SALT II by citing "Soviet violations" of these documents. [At this point the First Edition contains the additional passage "They cite the appearance in the USSR of an alleged second new type of ICBM -- the SS-25 -- and the 'excessive encryption' of telemetry information during missile launches. In this context the construction of a radar station in Krasnoyarsk is also mentioned, although, let us note in passing, this radar station has nothing to do with SALT II."] There is no substantial foundation for any of the U.S. [First Edition has "these" instead of "U.S."] claims. [At this point the First Edition contains the additional phrase "The Soviet side has demonstrated more than once, on the basis of concrete data, that"] The United States is deliberately distorting the picture and is diverting attention from its own violations of treaties and agreements. [At this point the First Edition contains the additional sentence "And the more it talks about Soviet "violations" the more obvious this truth becomes."]

Fact four. By renouncing observance of SALT I and SALT II, the U.S. Administration would simultaneously like to give the impression that it will "technically" observe [the preceding clause appear in the First Edition as follows: U.S. Administration would also like to gain some political capital. While giving the impression that they will 'technically' observe' SALT II for another few months (until MIRVed strategic delivery vehicles exceed the limit of 1,320 units [at this point the First Edition contains the additional phrase "as a result of the deployment of bombers with cruise missiles"], the Americans are declaring that they will, you see, observe the Soviet side's behavior throughout this period and "take it into account."

It is absurd to adopt this approach [at this point the First Edition contains the additional clause "in any event, and especially now" and omits the next two sentences]. Violators of treaties are not entitled to assume the role of their guardians. Moreover, it is impossible to proclaim the treaty and the accord to be "dead" and simultaneously to observe them, even "technically."

Washington's current course can be summed up as follows: If some U.S. military program conflicts with the existing treaty restrictions the agreements will be discarded. [At this point the First Edition contains the additional sentence "Arms get priority."]. While basically doing nothing to achieve new accords [at this point the First Edition contains the additional phrase "in the arms limitation sphere"], the United States is breaking the treaties and agreements that were already achieved in the seventies in the arms limitation sphere [the final part of this sentence reads as follows in the First Edition: "and agreements that have already been achieved"].

[At this point the First Edition contains the following additional paragraph: "This approach will do Washington no good either from the viewpoint of strengthening U.S. security or from the view point of Soviet-American relations or the development of the world situation as a whole."]

As the Soviet Government statement says, the United States will not manage to acquire military advantages for itself at the expense of others' security. The Soviet Union will take the necessary practical steps to prevent strategic military parity from being underminded. And The U.S. side should have no illusions about this.

The press conference participants answered numerous questions posed by journalists.

In particular, the reply to the question what the consequences would be -- from the viewpoint of the effect on international security -- of a decision by Reagan on nonobservance of the SALT agreements was as follows:

The consequences would be most negative and dangerous. Reagan's decision would effectively mean the destruction of a treaty system that curbs the nuclear arms race. This provocative step would cause an unbridled nuclear arms race and it would jeopardize the possibility of concluding new agreements. All this is taking place in conditions of the implementations of "star wars." It is clear that in this situation world tension would greatly increase and events in the sphere of arms creation [sozdaniye] would develop in an unpredictable way and could get out of human control.

The following question was asked. It was again pointed out in the Reagan statement that the SS-25 missile is a second new type of ICBM, banned under SALT II. Is this the case? And if not, why is it being so persistently repeated?

Here is the reply to this question: The Soviet Union has tested only one new type of ICBM -- the RS-22. This is permitted under SALT II.

When they refer to the testing of a second new type of ICBM in the Soviet Union, the Americans have in mind the RS-12M missile which is a modernization of our old ICBM, the RS-12. This kind of modernization is not prohibited and was carried out in strict compliance with the provisions of the treaty.

In the United States the clear provision of SALT II on the list of the elements which make up the so-called "throw-weight" of a missile was deliberately distorted. At variance with this provision the weight of certain elements which make up the throw weight of the old missile (RS-12) (means to overcome ABM defense and the warhead guidance device) is not included, while on the other hand, the weight of equipment used only during testing is illegitimately included in the throw weight of the modernized ICBM (the RS-12M). This is how they managed to create a "problem."

The aim is obvious. The United States already has one new type of ICBM (the MX missile). Now it is creating [sozdayut] another new type of ICBM (the Midgetman), which is at variance with the treaty. Hence stem the attempts to gain some kind of "right" to a second new type of ICBM and at the same time to slander the USSR as a partner in talks and to prepare the ground for the renunciation of the obligation to observe treaty provisions in the sphere of strategic arms limitation. [At this point the first edition contains the additional sentence: "On 27 May, the U.S. President translated this scheme into reality." This concluded the report published in the first edition.] In actual fact, there was no mention of the Soviet RS-12M missile at the time when the United States was making the decision about the Midgetman missile in addition to the MS. The story about the "Soviet violation" in this part of the treaty appeared later, and one can understand why.

The question about the encryption of telemetric information during ballistic missile tests by the Soviet Union was also raised at the press conference. Is this not a violation of SALT II?

It was emphasized in reply that the encryption of telemetric information transmitted from the missile is not banned by SALT II. The Second Common Understanding to Point 3 of Article XV of the treaty says that "each party" is free to use various methods of transmitting telemetric information during testing, including its encryption," except in cases when such encryption "impedes verification [kontrol] of compliance with the provisions of the treaty."

What are the treaty provisions in question? First and foremost, those relating to the definition of new types of ICBM's: type of propellant, number of stages, length, largest diameter, launch-weight and throw-weight of missiles, and the number and weight of warheads. They are defined in agreed statements to Article IV of the treaty.

We are strictly complying with all this. However, since the U.S. side raised the question of encryption, the Soviet side, in a gesture of a constructive approach, expressed readiness to resolve it on a reciprocal basis. We proposed to identify and agree upon the parameters of telemetric information which, in the U.S. side's opinion, must not be encrypted.

But the U.S. side has stubbornly evaded solving its own question. It has become evident, in light of the decision made by the United States regarding SALT II, that the United States is not at all interested in solving this question but needs to retain it as part of its ammunition of groundless accusations against the USSR.

A question was also asked about the fact that a radar station is being built in the USSR, in the Krasnoyarsk region, which is perceived by the U.S. Administration as a violation of the ABM Treaty. It is also known, on the other hand, that the United States is deploying a major radar station in Greenland and intends to deploy a similar station in Britain, with all this causing anxiety on the Soviet side. Is it not necessary to clarify the situation concerning this matter?

We have repeatedly produced facts, it was said in reply to this question, to prove to the United States that the Krasnoyarsk radar station, which is currently at the construction stage, is not meant to perform any ABM functions. It is a tracking station for objects in space, both Soviet and American, and in no way falls within the ABM Treaty. This will finally become evident when the station begins transmitting [nachnet rabotat na izlucheniye].

Regarding the new and powerful U.S. phased array radar stations, one of which is being deployed in Thule (Greenland) with the second planned for construction at Fylingdales (Britain), they are violations of the ABM Treaty. The U.S. side itself admits that it is talking about early-warning stations against ballistic missile attacks. It is well known, however, that under the treaty such stations must be sited only along the periphery of each side's national territory. Of course, neither Greenland nor Britain are either periphery or territory of the United States. Despite the fact that here the United States is clearly acting contrary to the ABM Treaty and we could have insisted that the situation be corrected without any steps in response by our side, the Soviet side, in a gesture of goodwill, expresses readiness to seek a solution to the problem concerning the stations. For example, with a view to ease mutual anxiety, we transmitted such a proposal to the Americans at different levels. We would halt the completion of construction at the Krasnoyarsk radar station, while the Americans would dismantle their station in Greenland and would not build a similar station in Britain.

This proposal is staring at the Americans from the table. But the United States is clearly interested not so much in eliminating the problem as in retaining it. The reason is obvious -- to exploit the Krasnoyarsk radar station issue for provocative political purposes and complicate the arms limitation and reduction process.

The following question was asked at the press conference. In your opinion, what effect could U.S. President Reagan's decision have on the planned Soviet-U.S. summit meeting?

It was emphasized in reply to this question that the Soviet side has repeatedly outlined its concept of USSR-U.S. summit meetings. Its essence is that meetings between the top leaders of the two countries must not be isolated from events occurring in the world and in Soviet-U.S. relations, particularly in the security sphere.

In other words, the holding of such a meeting requires the creation of the appropriate political atmosphere and also reciprocal readiness to move toward and aim for specific practical accords, primarily on arms limitation and reduction questions.

The provocative actions taken by the United States regarding the nonobservance of the SALT I and SALT II agreements offer no proof at all of its willingness to participate in the creation of the proper atmosphere, let alone to move toward specific accords. Moreover, the U.S. Administration has shown by these actions, coupled with others of which we have repeatedly and bluntly spoken to the U.S. side, that it favors a summit meeting in words, while in practice it is doing evetything to thwart the possibility of such a meeting.

This is how we perceive now the question of a summit meeting in light of the U.S. Administration's practical actions.

Other questions by journalists were also answered.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1408

MOSCOW TALK SHOW ON U.S.-EUROPEAN STRAINS

LD081955 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 8 Jun 86

["International Observers Round Table" program, with Gennadiy Shishkin, first deputy general director of TASS; Viktor Levin, All-Union Radio foreign policy commentator, and moderated by Nikolay Agayants]

[Excerpt] [Agayants] Hello Comrades! Among the events and phenomena in which this week has been so rich, I would like to single out immediately one thing that in my view has yet again highlighted clearly and very fully the chief trend of increasing confrontation between two courses, the two policies on the world scene today, which are pursued on the one hand by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, and on the other by the United States and its allies in various agressive blocs. The thing that I have in mind is first and foremost the clearly expressed attempt by the Washington administration to upset the military parity between the USSR and the United States which, as we all know, is the basis of strategic stability in the world. This time the attack is being made on the SALT II treaty -- an attack that is being actively joined not only by the President, but also by other high-ranking White House officials such as Pentagon chief Caspar Weinberger, State Department head George Sultz, and others of their ilk. Washington's dangerous course could be summed up as follows: When any U.S. military program starts to be in glaring contradiction to existing treaty limitations, these limitations are simply discarded by the administration. Why is this? What do you think lies at the base of it all, Gennadiy Arkadyevich?

[Shishkin] What I would say is that this week has in general been characterized by the fact that all the events that occurred were pushed into the background, as it were, by the explosion of indignation that has now seized the whole world over the decision by the Reagan administration to unilaterally denounce the extremely important documents of international law that have up to now kept the strategic arms race in check. Even the faithful U.S. NATO allies are now gripped by confusion, having seen for themselves where the ruinous consequences their constant connivance with the Washington hawks has led. Reflecting this mood, the British bourgeois newspaper THE GUARDIAN, for example, writes: If Europe has any influence left at all, it will fight desperately for the preservation of SALT II and the continuation of efforts in the sphere of arms reduction. It is a fight that must not be evaded or waged half-heartedly.

[Levin] One could add to the statement by that newspaper numerous statements by the press press in other West European countries.

The French L'ECHO writes that the Western alliance -- meaning NATO as a whole -- is undergoing a most acute crisis. The crisis in NATO is also described by the West [illegible] DEUTSCHE ALLGEMEINE, which notes that, while there have previously been periods of uncertainty in the North Atlantic alliance, it is only rarely that the signs of a split have manifested themselves so strongly. Now a large number of press organs in Western Europe are following up the statement of this fact with an analysis of what exactly has happened and why. Very typical of this, in my view, is something that was published by the British newspaper TODAY. It writes that the decisions by the U.S. presidents to ignore the provisions of the SALT II treaty have given rise to such a negative reaction additionally because quite recently, in early May at the meeting of the "Big Seven," Reagan twisted the arms of his West European partners to get their support for the theory of so-called international terrorism as interpreted by the United States, having stated before that he favors preserving the SALT II treaty. Then the West European countries, having as it were gained support for their stance regarding the need to preserve SALT II, took a step in their turn to meet the Washington administration halfway. Now Washington is trying cynically and brazenly -- TODAY does not draw this conclusion although there is every reason to draw it -- to twist the West Europeans around its little finger. It has forced them to join its policy of fighting against so-called international terrorism, which is in fact a policy of fighting against the national liberation movement, and it is rejecting the SALT II treaty.

I think that this very stormy reaction in Western Europe against the U.S. stance on SALT II is not due to this fact alone. Concentrated here, gathered here, are all the things that have been making themselves felt in the recent past. Just look. When Washington drew up the Strategic Defense Initiative program -- the star wars program -- this also met with a negative reaction in Western Europe. The United States then put a little pressure on the West Europeans, and first Britain, then the FRG, and then Italy joined the program. They did make certain provisos, but one way or another Western Europe basically followed the United States. After that -- I will not give a chronology of the developments, but just certain events -- there was an attack on Libya, an attack, a terrorist act, an act of international banditry that evoked indignation in the full sense of the word in Western Europe. Western Europe let it be known that the problem should be solved by political means, and in no way by resorting to the terrorist methods that Washington was insisting on. Washington scored that opinion.

In Bern quite recently, as we all remember, there was a meeting of experts within the framework of the Helsinki process on the development of contacts between people, institutions, and organizations. It was a complex meeting. There were many discussions, and they were acute ones. Common sense ultimately made it possible, however, to draw up a document that 34 countries represented at the meeting were ready to sign -- virtually all the countries that there were except the United States, which at the last moment refused to sign. They say that FRG Foreign Minister Genscher made a special telephone call to U.S. Secretary of State Shultz to persuade him to instruct the U.S. delegation to support the document, too, because it was a slap in the fact to Western Europe. Shultz ignored it.

The last of these events was the U.S. foisting on Western Europe of a program of chemical rearmament -- U.S. chemical rearmament -- which means the creation of stocks of binary chemical shells that can be sited in Western Europe. So first one concession, then another concession, and then a third concession led to the United States no longer taking Western Europe into account at all, and the West Europeans realized that if they were to continue on the same path, their interests would be absolutely wiped out, suppressed by the United States. At the same time, I should say that this is not so much a matter of emotional attitudes -- and no one likes being ordered about -- but of fundamental issues.

The United States is sacrificing the security interests of Western Europe and, one could also mention, its economic interests, by attempts to cut back trade between Western Europe and the Soviet Union, which the United States insists on very strongly. This goes fundamentally against the vital interests of the West European countries. I think that in the reaction to SALT II all this has manifested itself quite acutely, and it indicates that Western Europe has no wish to play the role in its alliance with Washington of the horse on which the Washington rider prances.

[Agayants] All that is certainly right, Viktor Nikolayevich, but once again I would like to draw attention to the following. The United States, while undertaking no practical action to achieve new agreements and accords on disarmament, is essentially rejecting the ones that have been adopted in the sphere of arms reduction. By its attitude to SALT II, the United States is revealing, in all its clarity, the essence of the current U.S. foreign policy course as one aimed at an all-out arms race, the militarization of space, and the further whipping up of international tension. In their statements on television, Shultz and Weinberger go on and on like machines speaking about the U.S. desire to show restraint and about the President's calls on the Soviet Union to join that course. But behind the loud words and confused oratory there is nothing concrete. Indicative in this respect was the press briefing in the White House on 3 June during which an adminstration spokesman answered a hail of direct questions by twisting and turning, but was in fact unable to explain anything to the journalists. Replying in particular to a question as to why it was that the SALT II treaty was not to the liking of the U.S., the official replied: Because, as the secretary of state has said, the treaty is becoming more and more obsolete. It does not even have a legal basis. We are entering into a structure, if you like, of new restraint, and we call upon the Russians to do the same. This is the way that Washington, doing a tightrope act with words, tries to confuse the issue.

[Shishkin] I think that all this shows quite obviously that Washington is now in fact coming up against quite strong opposition, not only in Western Europe, but at home, too. And hence, it seems to me, the Reagan administration is now in fact forced to go on to the defense, using the most unseemly methods that it has in its arsenal. By abusing its position, using all types of sophistry to disorient public opinion, resorting to outright falsification, manipulating the mass media, and whipping up a chauvinistic fervor in the country, the U.S. leadership, in order to please the extreme reactionary circles, is trying to conceal its attempt to upset the military parity between the Soviet Union and the United States which is the basis of strategic stability in the world, and is trying to justify all this by alleging that the Soviet Union has been violating the SALT II treaty.

[Agayants] Gennadiy Arkadiyevich, in the Soviet Government statement and at the news conference for Soviet and foreign journalists which took place this week in Moscow, it was clearly shown that such claims are unsubstantiated from beginning to end. The Soviet Union has not committed and is not committing any violations of the SALT II treaty, and the U.S. Government knows this well. The Soviet side has with facts at hand frequently exposed Washington's attempts, whenever any new U.S. military program is introduced that goes beyond the bounds of the existing treaty restrictions, to put forward far-fetched accusations against the Soviet Union.

[Shishkin] One should note, however, that despite all the efforts of the White House, very many cirtical and skeptical statements are creeping into commentaries, even in the bourgeois U.S. press. For example, the well-known magaine TIME writes that Reagan's statement last week signifies an important change in U.S. policy.

It is precisely this that has aroused the indignation of many U.S. allies in NATO, and also of the Soviet Union. This probably will have a negative effect on the chances for the holding of a second Soviet-U.S. summit meeting this year. U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, an openly right-wing U.S. magazine that is known for its close links with the Pentagon and that usually supports the administration, stresses that in making his decisions regarding the SALT II treaty Reagan has given preference to an exceptionally dnagerous strategy which has far-reaching consequences for arms control, the Western allaince, and the balance of power between the superpowers. This magazine notes that in the United States itself Reagan's decision is evoking anxiety even in the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They, the magazine writes, are worried by the fact that an open refusal to observe the SALT II treaty will worsen the U.S. position.

[Agayants] It is clear that these fears by competent U.S. military experts are not without some basis. For example, Academician Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, writes the following in an article just published in the magazine KOMMUNIST: As a scientist, I can state with full authority that our country possesses such a scientific, technical and production potential that in reply to any challenge we can create the most sophisticated weapons systems. By the way, this sort of thing has been frequently confirmed in recent decades. But this is not our choice, this is a course of action that has been foisted upon us, and that is diverting us from peaceful constructive work.

[Levin] Yes, it is worth dwelling on this. The Soviet Union rejects the primitive idea that the more weapons a state has, the more security it acquires. In the nuclear age this is no longer the case. In actual fact, in conditions of rivalry, stimulated by the U.S. military and industrial complex to increase the number of nuclear warheads and make military equipment more sophisticated, the exact opposite situation results. A qualitatively new level of military threat also makes new demands on defense means and on measures for ensuring the safety of the civilian population. Actions give rise to the appropriate counteractions. Thus, this is a vicious circle, and it can only be broken through agreements reached on a principled basis, whose final goal can only be that of scrapping nuclear weapons completely. This path is clearly and convincingly presented in the 15 January statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev on the phased elimination of nuclear weapons and other mass-destruction weapons by the year 2000.

[Shishkin] Viktor Nikolayevich, in connection with this I would like to note that of course it is no accident that the Soviet program for nuclear disarmament that you have just been talking about has been winning increasing numbers of new supporters throughout the world. Let us take, for example, a U.S. figure who is far from being someone who sympathizes with the Soviet Union -- (Hooks), former deputy secretary for the U.S. Air Force. In an article published in the United States this week he writes, and I quote: An intelligent assessment of the proposals set forth by General Secretary Gorbachev on 15 January amounts to the following: They promise a good opportunity for halting the siting of new kinds of weapons and reducing and stabilizing the colossal destructive might of both sides, which is sufficient for the destruction of each other many times over; and they create a favorable atmopshere for an improvement in the political relations between the two powers. In calling on the U.S. Administration to go from words to deeds in the matter of reducing armaments, the Russians have gone more than halfway. There is other evidence of the seriousness of the intentions of the Soviet Union on the matter of arms control. The main goal set by the 27th CPSU Congress, this former secretary notes, is to bring the economy into a healthy state, but in order to achieve this goal a stable international situation, and particularly stable relations with the United States, are needed. In the first place, Moscow has to avoid a new wide-scale arms race.

[Agayants] As you know, World Environment Day was marked on 5 June. It was commemorated, as has already been reported in the press, by the ceremony of the symbolic planting of a peace tree. As a statement by the Soviet Government stresses, this embodies the profound meaning of jointly defending our earth and affirming the choice worthy of people who favor peace and security and oppose war. We are deeply convinced that in the nuclear and space age, the security and survival of every state and international security as a whole can only be ensured not through military-technical solutions, not by multiplying arsenals and making weapons more sophisticated, but by consistently reducing and then completely scrapping mass-destruction weapons. It was precisely on World Environment Day that the United States, contrary to reason and in defiance of the will of peace-loving peoples, exploded yet another nuclear device at its test site in Nevada. This explosion, codenamed "Tajo," brought the number of tests carried out by the United States over the period since 1951 up to 651.

[Levin] By the way, Nikolay Ivanovich, do you recall how many explosions this makes since we introduced the moratorium on nuclear tests?

[Agayants] In all the Americans have carried out 12 such blasts. One should stress again that, indeed, the problem of protecting and improving the environment has long since ceased to be the affair of individual countries. It is of a pronounced global nature and for it to be solved the joining of efforts of peoples in all states is required. Our country has drawn the necessary and serious conclusions for itself from the Chernobyl accident and consistently comes out in favor of the broadest possible cooperation with all states in the solution of this problem as well. It is clear that such cooperation can only be implemented in conditions of stable peace on earth, and it is inseparable from the struggle of all people of good-will -- wherever they may live and whatever views they may hold -- from the resolute and consistent struggle to avert the most awful thing that might befall the planet earth, a nuclear holocaust. But the Americans are intensifying the arms race not only on earth but in space as well.

[Shishkin] Many people are of course beginning to question why President Reagan -- as we have already said here -- is continuing, against all reason and contrary to elementary logic, to advertise his program of star wars preparations as being purely defensive and to make assurances that it really is so. This question was answered this week by a U.S. political figure, with what I would describe as cynical frankness. He is well known in the United States and quite well known in our country too, namely Albert Gore, who wrote the following in THE NEW YORK TIMES: The President is still talking about the Strategic Defense Initiative as an all-encompassing defense system destined to replace our dependence upon the classical restraint, which is the threat of retaliation to a Soviet attack. Many administration representatives define the Strategic Defense Initiative, however, as a limited system for defending our retaliatory missile forces that will back them up rather than replace them. While the President is still dreaming of an economical and invulnerable system of antimissile defense that would be deployed [razvernut] jointly both by us and the Soviet Union, his secretary of defense is working out a rapid system to be deployed [razmeschchen] as soon as possible, regardless of how economical it is and regardless of cooperation with the Soviet Union.

[Agayants] As we can see, comrades, the Soviet Union was a thousand times right when it warned the world that Reagan's star wars program is aimed at whipping up the arms race, its goal being to attain military superiority over the Soviet Union and that it is fraught with the danger of unleashing a nuclear war. How can it be otherwise?

Let us recall, for instance, the results of the so-called purely scientific Manhattan Project, which was also made out to be an exclusively research program. It is common knowledge how it turned out for the population of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Fifteen billion dollars was spent on that program. In the 30 years between 1954 and 1983, $40 billion was spent on all scientific research work in the sphere of missile technology. Twenty-six billion dollars, however, is to be spent on the star wars research program in the near future, and in the decade from 1984 to 1993, $60 billion. If such research work -- if one can call it that -- continues for another 10 years, experts suggest this it will cost a total of $225 billion.

Considering such gigantic sums, it is naive to suppose that they would be spent solely on elucidating some theoretical questions relating to the possibility or impossibility of creating [sozdanye] space-strike weapons.

[Shishkin] The statement by Keyworth, the U.S. President's science adviser, is unambiguous, and I quote: We are engaged in research not to expand our knowledge of physics, but to learn how to create [sozdavat] large systems. What is thus involved is by no means pure research, but a serious stage in increasing military potential on a global scale. Using as a cover a verbal screen about the defensive nature of the Strategic Defense Initiative, it is not difficult to launch the development and creation [sozdaniye] of new means of attack as highly refined as you like.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1409

TASS: CSSR DELEGATE ADDRESSES MBFR SESSION

LD301345 Moscow TASS in English 1157 GMT 30 May 86

[Text] Vienna May 30 TASS --Head of the delegation of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic L. Handl addressed the plenary meeting today at the Vienna talks on Mutual Reduction of Armed Forces and Armaments in Central Europe. In his speech the Czechoslovak delegate devoted much attention to the Soviet peace initiatives aimed at the establishment of a comprehensive system of international security.

Czechoslovakia, L. Handl said, whole-heartedly supports the Soviet Union's peace proposals -- the fact reflected in the decisions of the 17th Congress of the Communist party of Czechoslovakia.

Having reiterated the interest of the socialist countries in attaining a mutually acceptable agreement at the Vienna talks, the head of the Czechoslovak delegation stated that arms reduction and a freeze on their level should be an inseparable element of the process of reaching such an agreement. L. Handl criticized the policy of the NATO countries that were stubbornly evading the solution of that question.

/9716
CSO: 5200/1405

IZVESTIYA SEES POTENTIAL FOR 'SUCCESSFUL' CDE CONCLUSION

Correspondent's Dispatch

PM060826 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 May 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent A. Sychev dispatch: "Vigorous Action"]

[Text] Stockholm -- A buzzer sounded in the Kulturhuset foyer, indicating the end of the latest session of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe [CDE]. Hardly had they left the plenary session hall than the delegation heads encountered a tight circle of correspondents. The main question was "what were the results of the session?"

Special envoy O.A. Grinevskiy, the Soviet delegation leader, answered: "The main work has been done in editorial groups. Interesting and, in our view, quite productive work is being done in the group dealing with questions of notification. Useful work has been done in the group dealing with observance; there has also been movement, albeit tentative, in the group dealing with the nonuse of force. Yet it must be said that the editing process is proceeding extremely slowly and mainly on secondary questions."

As is well known, the Stockholm conference is called upon to solve the acute and sensitive questions of security and confidence in Europe, questions closely linked with the overall state of affairs in the world. That is why the existence of two opposing courses in international policy, the socialist countries' constructive steps, and the active opposition to them on the part of the West are naturally leaving their mark on the progress of the conference.

The peace initiatives put forward recently by the Soviet Union have undoubtedly promoted the creation of a more favorable atmosphere at Stockholm. Following the fundamental line of their foreign policy -- to use all means to promote the quickest building of a reliable universal security system -- the USSR and the socialist states have taken an active stance at the conference. The socialist countries have made constructive proposals allowing the forum to gain impetus on all points of the final document.

It would be no exaggeration to say that most delegations are expressing sincere interest in the success of the conference. This is particularly shown in the position of the group of neutral and nonaligned states, and even among the NATO countries a growing interest in the search for accords can be noted.

But the conference continues to encounter other trends in its work. The overall hardening of Washington's foreign policy has been clearly seen in the position of the delegations from the United States and its closest NATO allies, which have substantially held up the conference's work.

Nobody, of course, expects the work of a forum such as the Stockholm conference to be easy. However, the problems that have arisen are often of an artificial nature.

The group dealing with the question of the nonuse of force continues to encounter serious difficulties. The attempts by its coordinator to activate the editorial work on aspects where viewpoints coincide have still not been met with the proper understanding by a number of Western states.

Notification or, rather, definition of the types of notification of military activity is another area of still unresolved problems. This question lies at the basis of several avenues: working out notification parameters for each type of activity, exchanging annual plans, and inviting observers.

In order to untie this knot and accelerate the elaboration of militarily substantive accords, the Soviet Union has proposed examining the notification problem in its different aspects. However, the United States and a number of other states are categorically refusing to provide notification about independent aircraft and naval activity.

Not extending confidence-building measures to aircraft means retaining the possibility of using them for blackmail and scare purposes and for carrying out a direct threat. Persistent attempts are made to exclude troop transfers to the European zone from notification too. The thrust of this approach is quite obvious -- to prevent the elaboration of substantive measures that would reduce the threat of military confrontation in Europe.

In order to give positive impetus at the conference to a businesslike discussion of this aspect the Soviet delegation put forward at the recent session specific parameters for ensuring notification of major ground forces exercises carried out independently or jointly with any possible air or naval force components or amphibious and airborne assault troops, indicating the numbers of divisions and any independent air exercises.

The position of the United States and its closest allies looks no better on the question of restrictions on military activity either. The level, scale, and intensity of exercises on the European continent these days are steadily increasing. Thousands of exercises each year on different scales are held in Europe. As a consequence the scale of activity is growing repeatedly and tension is intensifying.

Taking all these factors into account, the socialist states and the neutral and nonaligned countries have submitted a number of proposals to limit both the scale of exercises and their number. However, the British delegation stated that for it the general concept of a limitation threshold was unacceptable.

The Stockholm conference is a sensitive indicator of the desire and readiness of states to really strengthen confidence and security and strive to reduce the danger of war in Europe. There is only just enough time left. Yet the conference retains the potential for a successful conclusion. This would make it possible to decide to move to the conference's second phase devoted to disarmament in Europe and to give new impetus to the development of the Helsinki process in all its aspects.

Foreign Ministry Spokesman

PM031149 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 May 86 Morning Edition p 6

[TASS report: "At the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center"]

[Text] There was a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center on 27 May on current problems of international relations. It was addressed by V.B. Lomeyko, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Section, who drew attention to the new Soviet initiative expounded by M.S. Gorbachev at his meeting with British parliamentarians. In connection with the conference of experts from the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe countries that has ended in Bern, it was noted that at the last moment the U.S. delegation blocked the adoption of a final document elaborated on the basis of protracted consultation and compromises among all the participants.

This act can only be seen as a further illustration of the U.S. unceremonious and crude attitude toward the Europeans' needs and an attempt to undermine the all-European process.

In reply to questions about the work of the Stockholm conference, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman stressed that there is every chance of a successful completion of the first stage of this most important international forum provided there is a mutual desire on the part of the sides to achieve accords. This desire exists on the socialist side. This is evidence, in particular, by the socialist countries' specific, constructive proposals in all spheres of the conference's activity and their vigorous search for solutions to unresolved problems. But the United States and some of its allies are continuing, on various farfetched pretexts, to hinder the elaboration of mutually acceptable accords.

In the present situation the success or failure of the Stockholm conference is the willingness to seek -- not in words, but in deeds -- to reduce the danger of war on our continent. This is also essential for the new all-European meeting in Vienna that could decide to switch to the second phase of the conference, devoted to disarmament in Europe, which would contribute to the development of the Helsinki process in all spheres.

/9716
CSO: 5200/1405

FRG PAPERS VIEW GORBACHEV'S EAST BERLIN SPEECH

Proposals Said To Aim at Post-Reagan Era

Frankfurt FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU in German 22 April 86 p 3

[Editorial by Karl-Heinz Baum: "Message for the West"]

[Text] Berlin—The 11th SED Party Congress is over. General Secretary Erich Honecker was reelected; the Politburo, the actual ruling body in the GDR, was made slightly younger with four new members. Wages are to rise; the baby year is to be instituted with the first child; in the middle of next year the children's allowance will more than double for two or three children; the economy is to be further intensified and speeded up with even more electronics. These probably ought to be the basic pronouncements of this fourth party congress led by Erich Honecker.

However, the message from this SED party congress is an entirely different one. The General Secretary of the CPSU Mikhail Gorbachev put his stamp on it with his appearances before the plenum and on the site of the Potsdam Agreement concluded almost 41 years ago in the Prussian castle of Caecilienhof. The message for the West is this: In spite of SDI [Space Defense Initiative], in spite of bombs on Libya, the Soviets and with them the other countries of the Warsaw Pact are ready to talk.

Gorbachev emphasized this impressively with his proposal issued in East Berlin "to significantly reduce" conventional troops from the Atlantic to the Urals. He has thus undertaken an advance which—judging from the Western reaction—will not immediately be rejected like many previous Soviet proposals. In Bonn, Minister of Foreign Affairs Genscher and Minister of Defense Woerner jointly favor careful examination, and the response from Washington is not much different.

How serious the Soviet Union is about the reduction of conventional troops and armaments will only be determined through the negotiations of the experts. Many a great announcement has been ground down to nothing in the mills of the debates of the experts. It may be Gorbachev's goal to attempt again with this proposal to get US forces out of Western Europe or at least to reduce them considerably, an old Soviet dream in the 40 years since the anti-Hitler coalition based on the Potsdam Conference broke down.

The proposal also clearly has psychological targets: People in Western European countries will ask why we really must prolong compulsory military service--caused by the so-called "pill pinch," the decline in the birthrate--since there will soon be bilateral troop reduction in Europe anyway. Furthermore, the East Bloc is plagued by the same problem. Gorbachev can be believed when he says that the countries of the socialist camp would rather use increasingly more men who are now soldiers in the "building up of socialism." Furthermore, the reduction of Soviet forces can in fact possibly do more to reduce the "fear of the Russians" which exists in Europe than the reduction of atomic rockets, the strike force of which exceeds all powers of imagination anyway.

It was no accident that Gorbachev assured the Western Europeans at the westernmost outpost of his empire that the Soviet Union will never strike West Europe and guaranteed the single wish of reducing fear. In any case, Gorbachev's proposal is also a contribution to raising Soviet credibility in Western Europe. It comes at a time when Western Europeans, as the discussions between London and Rome indicate, are increasingly hard pressed to identify with the current government of the United States. Because the outcome of the proposals can only be measured in 3 years at the very least, and possible only in 10 years, it is also obvious that the young man--compared to US President Reagan--in the Kremlin is already looking toward the post-Reagan era and that Gorbachev is already laying the ground work for it.

For current politics there is the willingness for dialog announced by Gorbachev and repeated in harmony by SED General Secretary Erich Honecker and GDR Premier Willi Stoph that the meetings scheduled for this year between Reagan and Gorbachev as well as meetings at a lower level between Honecker and FRG Chancellor Kohl could take place--could, if no other strains intervene.

Gorbachev's demand for more economic involvement of the GDR and the other East Bloc countries in CEMA should cause much more concern for the GDR general secretary and his comrades in arms in the politburo (the political amalgamation of the EEC sends its regards). But the GDR is now an example of workaholics for the Soviet Union. What did Gorbachev say about that? The abbreviation DDR [GDR] is translated into Russian as "dawai, dawai, rabotaty"--fast, fast, work.

Proposals Called Primarily 'Propaganda'

Frankfurt FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE ZEITUNG in German 23 April 86 p 1

[Editorial by Fritz Ullrich Fack: "Disarmament As a Poker Game"]

[Text] A couple of years have passed now since the Soviets promised at the height of their anti-armament campaign to "scrap" all of their SS-20 rockets aimed at Europe down to a minimum if the West would renounce further armament. This truly amazing offer and its pathetic history in Geneva come to mind this week as one studies the cascadelike disarmament offers of General Secretary Gorbachev which range from the three-stage plan for abolishing all nuclear weapons to the reduction of conventional forces and weapons systems in Europe--"from the Atlantic to the Urals."

The former offer of "liquidation" of most Soviet mid-range rockets came from a famous mouth, i.e., from General Secretary Brezhnev. The Americans demonstrated great interest at that time and sought in Geneva to find out how that could be put into practical terms. Paul Nitze led the negotiations on the American side.

Very much to Nitze's displeasure, this newspaper--unchallenged--displayed details from the poker hand which revealed the complete implausibility of the Soviet disarmament offers. The general secretary's scrapping offer, spiritedly celebrated by the German leftist press, melted away in Geneva under Nitze's penetrating questions like butter in the sun. After countless painful convolutions it turned out that Moscow was ready not actually to "scrap" the rockets themselves but only their launching devices--in plain English: the special gun carriages. Because after the general secretary had once used the ominous word something in fact had to be scrapped. The moral of the story is that what general secretaries say is primarily intended for propaganda consumption. The "military-industrial complex" of the Soviet Union does not hesitate to disavow the general secretary if need be--provided that one does not assume that a rigged game is being played here.

Under the energetic Gorbachev we hear the trusting souls in this country again say that things will naturally be totally different. They say his offers must be taken at face value, confirmation of details saved for later. Here we can only recommend that the "details" really be dealt with, and priority be given, in fact, to those which are similar to Brezhnev's words "rocket liquidation."

This means the issue of the monitoring of all of those disarmament measures which Gorbachev is so freely offering. Among these he already has said with the first proposal--the three-stage plan for elimination of all nuclear weapons by the turn of the century--that the Soviet Union is prepared to permit international "on-site inspections" in addition to "national" verification measures. The specialists in the field pricked up their ears. Does this mean that the "keyhole thesis" from PRAVDA on 24 January 1984, according to which no one would be allowed to look into the private military activity of the Soviet Union, no longer holds?

Thus Gorbachev decided now when making his latest disarmament proposals in East Berlin to express nothing further about the inspection issue. He spoke conspicuously about "national means" and weakened on-site monitoring to a means to be used "if necessary." To really be able to evaluate this veiled retreat, one must find out what opposition the military mounted following Gorbachev's first monitoring speech.

They sent in Deputy Defense Minister Schabanov, who chairs the major administrative authority for weapons and armament in the Soviet general staff, and the government newspaper IZVESTIYA opened its columns to him. There the monitoring offer shriveled down to nothing just as Brezhnev's scrapping offer had once done, for only once were "reasonable measures" of (on-site) monitoring mentioned, which only can be considered when they "really contribute to the reduction of the arms race." National monitoring means would always have priority, and on-site monitoring would always be made

dependent on the scope of the disarmament steps agreed to. But on-site inspections which would only serve "to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries" would be completely out of the question. There it is again: the keyhole thesis.

It is consistent with that—and not with Gorbachev—that the Soviet Union has come to the Vienna troop reduction negotiations with a proposal which so completely reflects the fortress mentality of its military. The possibility of unannounced "suspicion monitoring" for chemical weapons was discussed there. The Soviets insisted that in each case the other side must present a "justified inquiry" and that an international control commission would then decide where and how checks would be made. So much for the subject of "surprise suspicion monitoring."

Schabanov's IZVESTIYA article revealed just what is to be expected from Gorbachev's propaganda offer concerning verification: nothing. The value of Soviet disarmament offers always decreases in the area of adequacy of monitoring if one digs deeply enough. The infuriating thing about it is the naivete of the Western public which takes the offers of Kremlin leaders at face value and thus deliberately ignores how the second level—often publicly—restricts what was said. People do not hear it because they do not wish to hear it.

Lothar Ruehl's Analysis

Bonn RHEINISCHER MERKUR/CHRIST UND WELT in German 26 April 86 p 3

[Article by Lothar Ruehl, State Secretary in the FRG Ministry of Defense: "Gorbachev Must Follow Up With Action: An Analysis of Moscow's Most Recent Disarmament Proposals for Conventional Troop Reduction"; first paragraph is RHEINISCHER MERKUR/CHRIST UND WELT introduction]

[Text] Mikhail Gorbachev, himself not yet completely established in the network of Kremlin power, has been carrying out a remarkable propaganda campaign directed at the West for months. After the proposals for total nuclear disarmament by the year 2000 presented on 15 January, Gorbachev has now gone to the public on 18 April, during the SED party congress, with a new grandiose sounding plan for the reduction of conventional troops in Europe "from the Atlantic to the Urals" (a De Gaulle expression!). The West has always called for progress in the area of conventional disarmament as a flanking step for the reduction of the nuclear arsenal because that is where the overwhelming superior strength of the East is particularly obvious. Whereas the United States answered Gorbachev's January proposals at the end of February, there has still been no concrete Western response to the most recent push. In the following, Lothar Ruehl, Habilitatus PhD and State Secretary in the FRG Ministry of Defense, examines what requires careful attention in this Kremlin offer.

Mikhail Gorbachev's most recent offers of 18 April in East Berlin are obviously supposed to fill in the gaps in his previous disarmament proposals. The offer is vague but interesting. It includes demands and ideas of the West

for negotiation results in Vienna on bilateral troop reduction in Central Europe, in Stockholm for the creation of trust and disarmament in all of Europe, and in Geneva for the inclusion of short-range ballistic weapons in parity restrictions. The fundamental characteristic of these proposals which need interpretation and amendment is that with them Gorbachev raises more questions than he answers.

For a New Balance of Forces Between the Atlantic and the Urals

Therefore the first task of the East-West discussions on all relevant themes is to define the subjects and principles for negotiation. This is especially valid for the issue of whether "a meaningful reduction of all components of the land forces and tactical air forces of the European states as well as the corresponding U.S. and Canadian forces stationed in Europe" (Gorbachev) is to include all Soviet land and tactical air forces in the European portion of the USSR as a starting point. The expression that the area included in the reduction should include "all Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals" permits, in fact, no other interpretation. This means that some two-thirds of all Soviet land and air forces and the "strategic tactical" rocket troops with ranges between 100 and 1000 kilometers would have to be included in the negotiations.

Expressed numerically that means:
-1.4 million soldiers in the land forces and the tactical air forces
-135 combat divisions
-40,000 combat tanks
-35,000 guns over 100 mm and rocket launchers
-4,600 fighter planes of the tactical air forces
-1,200 strategic tactical rockets

This magnitude reflects the problem of the reduction of the Warsaw Pact's conventional superiority in Europe: In order to create a balanced relationship of forces between the West and the East the Soviet Union would have to make the greatest contribution to the reduction of these forces, for otherwise a reduction of its military superiority could not be achieved.

Gorbachev's 18 April speech contains no indication of a Soviet willingness to do this. "Meaningful" reductions, as Gorbachev calls them, could be proportional to the troop strength of each country and therefore unequal, without balancing the difference between the troop strength of the East and the West. Therefore, the Western premises in the Vienna negotiations on joint troop reduction in Europe are not "proportional," but rather "asymmetric." The starting point is the excess on the Eastern side.

Gorbachev's intentions need clarification also concerning the method of accounting: "All European countries" also includes the neutral countries of Yugoslavia, Switzerland, Sweden, Austria, and Finland. How and where are their forces to be figured in?

The MBFR [Mutual Balanced Forces Reduction] negotiations on East-West troop reduction, which has as its object a concrete military-political security relationship, i.e., Central Europe in a geographically limited area between NATO and the Warsaw Pact, is based on comparable military characteristics with

defined goals--mutual maximum strengths. A negotiation based on "Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals" would have to be carried out on the basis of the military reference quantities of the East-West force relationship since all countries would have to participate without regard to their geographic location, their relationship to an alliance, and the size and type of their forces. In such a negotiation, how is a mutual standard of security through reduction of forces to be agreed upon? Would security in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals become any greater if the forces of all countries including the American forces stationed in Europe are reduced by an equal percentage--10 percent or 30 percent? How are such reductions to be tallied up as a militarily sensible relationship between potential enemies?

This is especially valid for the major weapons systems which give the forces their fighting strength, striking and defensive capability, and their mobility: fighter planes, combat tanks, guns, tactical vehicles, and ballistic weapons.

How are physical distribution, distance and range of possible targets on each enemy side, reinforcement capabilities, mobilization ability, and also reserves and ordnance depots to be taken into consideration? These factors do not lend themselves to change according to the same measurements without altering the makeup of forces and their logistical infrastructure.

These observations point to the basic question: that of monitoring compliance with commitments. How can these be verified effectively, constantly, and reliably? In this regard, Gorbachev even took on-site inspections into consideration "if necessary," but also spoke of "national technical means," i.e., remote reconnaissance means. Without a system for international monitoring, effective verification is inconceivable. This is also valid for a "chemical-free zone in Europe," which should not be limited to parts of Europe anyway if it is supposed to produce increased security. Western proposals go much farther on this issue than those of the East because they are aimed at verifiable elimination of all chemical weapons and their production sites worldwide--the only sure solution to the problem.

In fact, in connection with chemical weapons, the Soviet stance has previously been ambiguous in the matter of controls: "Controls based on suspicion" such as those demanded by the Western side must be "justified" and "examined" before they can be carried out. It remains to be seen whether effective and verifiable commitments will result from the continuing negotiations in Geneva dealing with chemical weapons and in Vienna dealing with verification of troop reductions. In this same regard, it remains to be determined what Soviet Deputy Defense Minister Schabanov means in IZVESTIYA by his restrictive remarks on "reasonable" control measures; in any event, Gorbachev's proposal on this major point seems already to be qualified.

Moscow's Offensive Capability Must Not Be Retained

The conclusive indication of the willingness to give a militarily significant Europe an increase in more stable, i.e., more crisis-proof, security against military threats would be the elimination of the offensive structure of the

Soviet forces and of the Warsaw Pact, especially in Central Europe. Here the Soviet military power holds a striking establishment with superior force which gives it the option to invade Western Europe by undertaking expansion of reinforcements and western movement of troops out of Russia.

Therefore the Vienna troop reduction negotiations will remain the testing ground for Soviet willingness to disarm in Europe. Furthermore, the Soviet Union can demonstrate in Stockholm whether it is actually willing to open up to international trustworthiness in its European section and to reduce the conventional strike force of its military machine over the western front in Central Europe so that it no longer oppresses Europe.

Soviet diplomacy must contribute to the negotiations on the security of Europe with concrete offers of long overdue concessions for mutual advantage. Only in this way can the content and consequences of Gorbachev's words be tested.

Proposals Seen Aimed at Soviet Bureaucracy

Hamburg DIE ZEIT in German 2 May 86 p 5

[Article by Christoph Bertram: "The Man Wants To Talk; Mikhail Gorbachev's Disarmament Package, Not Simple Propaganda, But No Finalized Plan Either"

[Text] If the Soviet general secretary had the intention to make both Western politicians and Soviet bureaucrats equally insecure with his cascade of disarmament proposals, he clearly succeeded. In Western chancelleries the experts are puzzling over what induced the Soviet party leader to nudge the admittedly sterile disarmament debate out of its beaten path with repeated new advances—pure propaganda or a sincere willingness to negotiate. And in the places where the test can actually be run on the sample, i.e., in the East-West negotiations in progress from Stockholm to Vienna and Geneva, Soviet diplomats have so far shown little willingness to match their leader's grand words with commensurate actions.

"The minimalists are at work," an experienced Western diplomat assesses the behavior of his Soviet colleagues—a judgment which could have been generated by the reaction of many a Western government, not just the one in Washington. In fact, it would suit the bureaucratic blockheads in the East and the political hawks in the West if Gorbachev's melodious disarmament offensive would quickly fizzle due to lack of substance. The Kremlin leader is therefore taking quite a risk. If he does not succeed in closing the gap between his pronouncements in the public forum and the actions of his representatives in secret negotiations, his credibility will be jeopardized—at home as well as abroad.

Moscow's Old Refusal

This is becoming especially clear in an area which has increasingly become a touchstone for arms control for the West in recent years, which however has been and remains to be a hot potato for the Soviets: The monitoring of

agreements, called verification in disarmament jargon. Recurring like a refrain in Gorbachev's package of proposals of 15 January 1986 was the willingness, in the interest of arms control, finally to tone down the old Soviet refusal to allow foreign observers to peek at their military cards.

The three-stage plan for total nuclear disarmament would be extensively monitored, both with national technological means (such as satellite reconnaissance) and with on-site inspections. "The USSR is ready to agree to any additional monitoring measures." In the proposal for an agreement to a test ban he says, "Monitoring is no problem for us." If there were a space weapons ban, Gorbachev would also be ready for "the most stringent monitoring, including the opening of relevant laboratories for inspection." For the destruction of chemical weapons and the shutting down of the corresponding manufacturing sites, he demands a "new view of things" and promises "strong controls, including international on-site inspection." And the general secretary even promises to remove the stumbling block in the Vienna negotiations of how possible troop movements could be monitored: "We start from the premise that eventual agreement on troop reduction naturally requires reasonable oversight. We are prepared to accept that." In addition to national means, "permanent monitoring positions could be established which would monitor the movement of any troop contingents in the reduction zone."

In the doldrums of the negotiations, so far only a breeze can be felt from this fresh gust of wind from the general secretary. With the most recent Soviet proposals for the proscription of chemical weapons, which were presented last week at the Geneva disarmament conference, the willingness for a permanent international team of inspectors is in fact confirmed. But the international watchdogs are only to work jointly with national inspectors and then only if agreed to in individual cases by the country under suspicion: Hence suspicion monitoring only with the consent of the suspect!

In the Vienna negotiations on troop reduction in Europe there is also still very little trace of "the new view of things." To be sure, the Soviet negotiators have agreed to controls, but only of a sort that can control very little. At the beginning of April, Robert Blackwell, chief of the American delegation, described the Soviet position as "a bad joke": "The good news is that the East is ready to install permanent observation posts. The bad news is that virtually no Soviet troops would have to pass them to enter or leave the troop reduction zone"—in particular not the approximately 200,000 Soviet soldiers who are exchanged annually among the allies in East Europe and the USSR.

So, what are Gorbachev's intentions with his proposals? Are they only propaganda? Or is there a sincere design for disarmament behind them?

Probably neither assessment is totally accurate. Of course, gems of propaganda are part of the craft and are conspicuous again in the latest proposals. That is particularly true of the noble vision of an atom-free world by the year 2000: No one, not even Mikhail Gorbachev, can seriously believe that atomic weapons can be un-discovered, the genie sealed back in the bottle. But only propaganda? After all, not only did the most important man

in the Soviet Union preach a message of general salvation, but he became almost unnecessarily concrete into the bargain. He is, unlike his predecessors, willing to completely eliminate the SS-20 rockets in exchange for Pershing II's and cruise missiles. He thus sanctions the Western arms buildup in retrospect. He wants to negotiate about medium-range weapons in Europe even if the United States insists on its Star Wars plans. He agrees with Ronald Reagan's demand for deep cuts in the strategic arsenal--the Soviets brusquely rejected a similar proposal from Jimmy Carter in March 1977. He declares himself ready to reduce troops not only in East Europe but also in the European part of the Soviet Union--this, as if former Soviet governments had not insisted that Soviet territory was exempt from the Vienna negotiations. With all of these new statements, the new Kremlin chief did not abandon any central Soviet positions. However, he did declare arguments outmoded that his predecessors once considered inscribed in concrete. That is more than was necessary for mere propaganda, and certainly more than is suitable to many in the Moscow apparatus.

Still Much That Is Unfinished

On the contrary: Gorbachev did not in any case present a unified disarmament plan. There is still too much which is unfinished. And with all his flexibility, the Soviet party chief holds unwaveringly to positions which are already assured of uncompromising rejection from the West. For the present, there is absolutely no hint that the gap might be bridged. That is not true merely for space weapons, which President Reagan will not give up. Gorbachev wants to make the elimination of the SS-20's dependent on a freeze of the modest British and French rocket arsenals, although England and France have clearly rejected this for a long time. The old Soviet demand that "strategic offensive weapons" must include all American systems, even short-range rockets and airplanes, which threaten Soviet territory will be presented again this time, as it has been every time since 1969, although the United States always rejects it.

There is also the fact, surprising to many in the West, that the Kremlin leader is obviously making his proposals without their having been completely thought out and formulated in all details. SPD representative Egon Bahr, who called on Gorbachev's chief foreign affairs adviser Dobrynin last week, was told concerning the most recent offers about reduction of conventional troops that work is still in progress in Moscow to fill out the framework set up by Gorbachev. And when Western diplomats in the current forums on East-West arms control fished for information from their Soviet colleagues about what the most important man in the Kremlin might have meant by this or that public expression, they frequently came up against embarrassed silence. It is obvious that there is not only often a lack of clear instructions from headquarters but also of clarity at headquarters itself.

But what is Gorbachev's goal with his mixture of visions, partial concessions, and old positions? In all likelihood the general secretary's strategy is shaped by a whole assortment of motives.

First: Gorbachev is not counting on a quick outcome of negotiations. The price which Washington is demanding is too high for him. As long as the

United States holds on to its SDI program, as long as Ronald Reagan refuses to give priority to arms control at the next summit, according to Gorbachev, nothing will happen.

Second: Independently of negotiations, the Kremlin chief wants to free Soviet positions from all the hardening and entrenchment that have increased there in recent years and now restrict Soviet negotiating room. The Moscow design for disarmament ought to become more conclusive and more convincing. For now, Gorbachev can produce a positive reaction in Western public opinion for it; in the future, he can perhaps enter negotiations with a better chance of success. And because the reform of Soviet disarmament policy would quickly smother in the encrusted Moscow apparatus, Gorbachev is trying to establish its general direction through public pronouncements from above--as he did in his economic policy. There is time for the details later.

Third: The general secretary wants to slow down Western armament policy at least through offers if he cannot yet limit it through treaties. In the security policy discussions of the West there will always be the possibility that there is the alternative of arms control instead of new armament: the offer of radical reduction instead of new American strategic weapons, the offer of regional and worldwide elimination of chemical weapons instead of new ones; the offer of a test moratorium instead of the development of killer satellites in space, the alternative of abolition of all "strategic tactical" missiles instead of the consideration of a West European defense against Soviet short-range rockets. The Soviet Union, Gorbachev well knows, needs quiet on the armament front in order to nurse its economy to health. Although the price for an agreement with the West may currently be too high, Western armament plans can at least be slowed down through offers which appeal to the public.

The strategy has its risks. Gorbachev's initiatives could meet with increasing skepticism in Western public opinion if no action follows all this talk. In the United States Gorbachev's public diplomacy has already triggered annoyance and reinforced the hawks, who already consider the whole thing a pure propaganda maneuver. And in the bureaucratic-military complex of the Soviet Union the opposition to the top-level advances could become insurmountable if Gorbachev's initiatives fail to produce any positive Western reaction.

So the Soviet party chief needs the help of Western governments. With continually renewed Western rebuffs--as for example with the proposal for an atomic test ban--Gorbachev's room to maneuver becomes limited from the domestic side as well. Only if the West picks up on one or another idea, probes it, and does not recoil from rethinking some of its own beloved ideas, will the Soviet leadership and its bureaucracy be required to flesh out the still vague designs of its party chief. And vice versa: The advocates of arms control in the West need Gorbachev. For without his proposals the prospects for possible agreements would be even more dismal than they are now. The man at least wants to be talked to.

How many partners the general secretary has in Moscow for his plans he himself knows best. There are certainly not many in the West: The United States does

not think much of his proposals. France and Great Britain are holding back on account of the continued Soviet attempt to prune back their atomic weapons indirectly. For the FRG, Minister of Foreign Affairs Genscher said in the current session of the Bundestag concerning the most recent Kremlin initiative: "We are taking the Soviet proposals seriously and believe that the possibilities of a new phase in West-East relationships should not be neglected." The entire FRG government should seize this even though the Soviet Union has so far shown little willingness to win the FRG over to its plans. On the contrary: In Gorbachev's speech to the SED party congress in which he conveyed his latest disarmament initiative the policies of the FRG government were again reprimanded. Also it is questionable whether the Kremlin chief already has a complete strategy or is still working only on the blueprints. The latter would seem likely. Because the tempo that Mikhail Gorbachev has set makes it easy to forget that he has been in office for scarcely less than a year. Whoever wants to test Gorbachev's sincerity should not hold him too strictly to time limits.

12666
CSO: 5200/2686

LOWN MESSAGE HAILS TEST MORATORIUM EXTENSION

PM201520 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 May 86 First Edition p 1

["Message From Prof B. Lown"--PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Esteemed General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev! On behalf of the "International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War" movement I salute and congratulate you on the announcement of the extension of the Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests. You have performed an act of unprecedented statesmanship. Our movement, which includes physicians from 41 countries, pledges to redouble its efforts to persuade the U.S. Government to follow your example and thus ensure the establishment of a mutual Soviet-American moratorium, which could lead to the conclusion of a lasting treaty on a general and total ban on nuclear weapon tests. We believe that a mutual moratorium meets the security interests of the Soviet Union, the United States, and all the countries of the world.

As you know, Mr General Secretary, the "International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War" movement and its national branches have long emphasized that a test moratorium is the most promising strategy in the disarmament sphere. Scientists all over the world agree that a Soviet-American test moratorium would be easy to verify. In an age of distrust it is a measure that does not require trust. The halting of tests would hinder the creation of new, destabilizing arms systems. It would accord with earlier commitments, in particular those directed against tests and the provisions of the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons. It would graphically demonstrate to the whole world the seriousness of the two major powers' intention to reverse the nuclear arms race. It would not adversely affect the security interests of either the Soviet Union or the United States. In fact, in a nuclear age Americans and Soviet people share the same destiny and a Soviet-American moratorium on tests, which would be observed right up to the conclusion of a treaty on a general and total ban on nuclear weapon tests, is a joint and mutual step forward.

Respectfully, Bernard Lown, cochairman of the "International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War" movement.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1410

USSR: PHYSICIANS AGAINST NUCLEAR WAR CONGRESS URGES TEST BAN

Gorbachev Message

LD291952 Moscow World Service in English 1000 GMT 29 May 86

[Text] A world congress of the movement International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War has opened in Cologne, Federal Germany. It's attended by over 3,000 delegates from more than 50 countries. The co-chairman of the movement, Soviet cardiologist Yevgeniy Chazov, conveyed greetings form the general secretary of the Soviet Communist Party's Central Committee, Mikhail Gorbachev, to the applause of the participants. The Soviet leader singled out the great international authority of the movement. The message says that by explaining the disastrous consequences of nuclear war to the public, doctors direct people at energetically counteracting those who don't want to realize the threat looming over every family in a nuclear age. The Soviet leader stressed that the noble efforts of medical workers in the struggle against the ghost of the last epidemic has won them respect everywhere. Mikhail Gorbachev wished the delegates success in their work for general benefit.

Lown, Rau Addresses

LD291200 Moscow TASS in English 1156 GMT 29 May 86

[Text] Cologne May 29 TASS -- By TASS correspondent Gennadiy Kulbitskiy:

The participants in the movement International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War can take pride in their considerable accomplishments.

For millions of people on earth, they have dispelled the fog of ignorance and impelled them to ponder seriously over the heinous realities of nuclear war, Professor Bernard Lown has pointed out.

He addressed the 6th World Congress of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, which opened here today, on behalf of the Soviet and American co-presidents of the movement.

Dr. Lown said that broad sections of the world public were presented with a list of baneful effects of the use of nuclear weapons. More and more people were convinced that medicine could do nothing to help nuclear war victims or even alleviate their suffering.

Introducing a moratorium on all nuclear explosions was adopted by members of the international movement of physicians as the first medical prescription, he said. The moratorium could be verified even by national means up to the blast yield of less than one kiloton.

The movement was persistently striving for the implementation of this top-priority task, Dr Lown said. That was why, he noted, that the physicians welcomed the Soviet Union's suspension of nuclear tests form August 6 to December 31, 1985.

To achieve a real success, however, it was necessary that the United States reciprocate. The West's response to the Soviet initiative caused disappointment within the ranks of the movement.

Dr Lown highly assessed the Soviet Union's decision to extend its unilateral moratorium on any nuclear blasts till the next "Hiroshima Day" -- August 6, 1986.

"I back the demand for an end to nuclear weapons testing," Johannes Rau, minister president of North Rhine-Westphalia State (Federal Republic of Germany) and leading SPD [Social Democratic Party] chancellor candidate, told the congress.

"The decision to end any nuclear explosions is simultaneously a test of the seriousness of one's intentions to put an end to the arms race. The termination of testing should be followed by other comprehensive disarmament steps.

I see no more obstacles to ending nuclear weapons tests after the Soviet Union unilaterally suspended nuclear explosions and expressed its readiness for international control."

The plenary session was addressed by New Zealand's Prime Minister David Lange who came out in favour of ending the nuclear arms race.

Concluding a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty, leading to the limitation of the growth of nuclear weapons arsenals, he said, would become a considerable contribution to curbing the arms race.

Mankind possessed technologies, he pointed out, that allowed verification of the treaty. The only roadblock to concluding it was the absence of political will.

Lessons of Chernobyl

LD301601 Moscow TASS in English 1527 GMT 30 May 86

[Text] Cologne May 30 TASS--By TASS correspondent Gennadiy Kulbitskiy:

The 6th World Congress of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW) is continuing its work here.

Physicians and other health workers from more than fifty countries, and numerous guests, who arrived in this major industrial and cultural centre of the Federal Republic of Germany, started debates on concrete and urgent topics concerned with the further invigoration of their campaign for the prevention of nuclear war.

The art of physicians will be totally irrelevant and any means of medicine ineffective in case of a thermonuclear catastrophe to which mankind is being pushed by aggressive U.S. and NATO circles.

That is why the chief task of the IPPNW movement is to campaign vigorously against the mounting threat of nuclear war, for ridding mankind of nuclear armaments.

This idea keynoted most of the speeches made by the delegates to the congress.

The delegates expressed their profound concern over the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant. Their statements expressed understanding of the misfortune that struck the USSR, and respect for the Soviet people, including Soviet physicians for their selfless work on resolving the complicated and diverse tasks of overcoming the consequences of the accident. The speakers expressed sincere sympathy and support.

That tragic event, said a statement of the IPPNW movement, unanimously adopted by the delegates, confirmed the correctness of the warning long since made by the movement: medicine would be powerless even if only a few warheads exploded.

There was no nuclear explosion in Chernobyl, still all of Europe was affected. The news of the Chernobyl accident impelled members of the movement to step up their campaign against nuclear war with all means at their disposal.

Nuclear war would become the last tragedy, the statement said, reminding physicians all over the world of their professional duty to try to avert the great threat to very life on earth.

Reactionary press bodies in the Federal Republic sought to use the developments in Chernobyl to try and split the international movement of physicians.

The newspaper DIE WELT, a mouthpiece of the reactionary circles, prophesied "collapse" of the congress in connection with the Chernobyl accident.

Professor Bernard Lown (USA), co-president of the IPPNW, told the TASS correspondent that various views of the atomic power plant accident in the USSR were being made at the congress. "Despite that, the congress is a success."

Dr. Lown said it was necessary to counter any attempts to use the tragic event for anti-Soviet purposes. "Chernobyl is our common misfortune. That is why the demand for a moratorium on all nuclear explosions and a call on the U.S. Administration to follow the USSR's example are so timely today."

The West German section of the IPPNW today submitted for consideration to the workshop "Atomic Energy" a document entitled "Time to Awaken". It appealed to the politicians to "apply maximum efforts for the immediate termination of nuclear weapon tests worldwide, and for the establishment of a zone in Europe that would be free of nuclear and chemical weapons. [no closing quotation marks as received]

A discussion on the role of journalists in preventing nuclear war was held today for the first time in the history of world congresses of the movement. Mass media representatives from the USSR, the United States, Britain, West Germany, Hungary and other countries took part.

During the interesting and sometimes keen debate, the journalists considered in detail the questions of responsibility of journalists and their contribution to the common cause of mankind -- that of preserving peace on earth.

Many people took part in the debate. Western journalists were asked many questions concerning their reluctance to devote more materials to the broadening anti-war movement, including the international movement of physicians.

Appeal To U.S., USSR

LD011449 Moscow TASS in English 1304 GMT 1 Jun 86

[Text] Cologne June 1 TASS — TASS correspondent Gennadiy Kulbitskiy reports:

The Sixth International Congress of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War movement ended here today. The congress brought together more than 3,000 delegates and guests from over 50 countries.

The participants in the congress adopted an appeal to the Soviet and U.S. leadership, emphasizing the imperative need for the United States to join the moratorium on all nuclear explosions, announced by the Soviet Union, and also for conducting without delay talks on banning tests. The moratorium on nuclear blasts will bridle the driving force of the arms race, block the development of more and more sophisticated, accurate, compact and destabilizing first strike weapons, which it becomes increasingly more difficult to control.

The governments of the USSR and the United States, two powerful countries of the world, bear special responsibility to the entire mankind in the cause of banning nuclear tests -- the first step on the road to eliminating nuclear weapons from arsenals, the appeal says. To give concrete expression to your responsibility to the future generations and protect the health of the present generations, above all children, we call you to take the following steps:

-- To guarantee the allocation of resources for the immunization of all children on earth by the year 1990, which is the objective of the World Health Organization and the U.N. Childrens' Fund,

-- To earmark part of the funds released in the process of disarmament for health protection programmes in the interests of the children in the developing countries,

-- To exclude the development of space arms and to invest funds instead in the medical communication programme so as to make the achievements of medicine accessible to the whole of mankind.

The appeal says that it is within the capabilities of the Soviet Union and the United States to effect these measures. In the International Year of Peace these two countries can demonstrate that science and technology which follows it serve one goal solely, namely, to improve life on earth rather than threaten it with extinction.

A message to six leaders -- participants in the initiative of five continents -- supports their point of view as regards banning nuclear explosions. A mutual Soviet-U.S. moratorium, to which you called in your joint messages to U.S. President Ronald Reagan and the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev, is the measure of limiting armaments on which the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War movement focussed all its attention last year, it says.

The concluding session of the international congress approved one more document -- a medical recipe of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War. It says that on July 1, 1985, the members of this movement have come up with a medical recipe which makes it possible to do away with the most awesome threat to human health. They urgently called for announcing immediately a moratorium on all nuclear blasts as a first indispensable step towards reversing the nuclear arms race. The International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War come up once again with this medical recipe and urge the governments of the United States and all other nuclear powers to join the USSR and announce a moratorium on nuclear weapons tests. The positive aspects of this medical recipe for averting a nuclear war are obvious.

Addressing the concluding session, Academician Yevgeniy Chazov of the USSR, co-chairman of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War movement, said: "The USSR and the United States, other Western and Eastern countries could use satellities to develop not a military system but a system which would enable any doctor in any country of the world to receive any information and consultation for the sake of saving human life. And which is the main thing, this will be an example of what the countries across the world can do if they pool their efforts in combatting diseases, hunger and illiteracy.

This will be our best answer to those who are keen on sowing enmity and hatred among us and going ahead in these conditions with the nuclear arms race. We cannot sit on our hands, we do not have the right to be silent."

The next international congress of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War will be held in Moscow next year.

Press Conference

LD031732 Moscow TASS in English 1718 GMT 3 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow June 3 TASS -- Existence of nuclear arsenals are incompatible with human life. Each person must comprehend this idea, said Professor Bernard Lown (USA), a co-president of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War. He spoke at a press conference today in Moscow on the results of the Cologne congress of this movement, which has just ended and which was attended by 4,600 medics from 59 countries.

The Cologne meeting has shown that doctors attach special importance to the moral aspect of the nuclear danger, Lown went on to say, it is incomprehensible how it was possible to stockpile so much genocide weapons. They will make no distinction between grownups and children, sick and healthy people, will destroy all mankind, he pointed out.

Our actions are aimed at bringing the opinion of doctors about the deadly danger of the nuclear arms drive to the world public. The prohibition of nuclear tests is the main idea of the explanatory programme undertaken by our movement, Lown underlined. Following the FRG and the USSR, the movement's leaders will visit China and Japan. We shall go to Hiroshima, Lown said, which was the first victim of nuclear bombing where it is inscribed on the grave of the dead: "Sleep in peace, the error will not be repeated."

The Cologne congress issued a "prescription" for saving mankind whose essence is to stop immediately nuclear tests, noted Soviet Academician Gevgeniy Chazov, the second co-president of the movement. The task of peace advocates is to prod the U.S. Administration to join the Soviet nuclear tests moratorium.

The Chernobyl tragedy serves as a formidable warning of the nuclear danger, said Chazov. The explosion of steam with a radioactive release struck 299 people with radiation disease, 23 of them are dead. But we should remember that one megaton nuclear bomb alone can take the toll of at least 300,000 lives. In case of a nuclear war, destruction threatens every citizen of the world, and any medical assistance will be useless and totally ineffective.

The Cologne congress proposed an idea of holding regional symposiums of doctors: European -- in Madrid, Latin American -- in Havana, similar meetings will be held in Washington and New Zealand.

USSR's Chazov Interviewed

LD022337 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1953 GMT 2 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow, 2 Jun (TASS) -- The so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" being put forward by the U.S. Administration will greatly increase the probability of nuclear conflict, said chairman of the Soviet Committee of the Physicians of the World for Prevention of Nuclear War movement Academician Gevgeniy Chazov.

Upon his return to Moscow today from Cologne (FRG) where the 6th Congress of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War organization has ended, he gave an interview to the TASS correspondent at the steps of the plane.

The congress participants, the Soviet scientist said, stressed that according to the conclusions of specialists, a total nuclear war would mean the end of civilization. The explosion of charges of 10,000 megatons strength will immediately kill 1.15 billion people and injure 1.095 billion.

Radioactive fallout will provoke cancerous disease and genetic defects among millions of people. It will be centuries before the possibility emerges of the restoration of social and economic life.

The participants in the congress welcomed the Soviet Union's extension of the moratorium on nuclear explosions until 6 August, Geveniy Chazov said. If the American Administration joined the USSR's initiative, it would reliably impede the perfection of nuclear weapons because not one new model of weapons is accepted without testing the warhead that it will deliver to its target.

"That is why we consider that the main task of the peace champions is to induce the American Administration to join the Soviet moratorium," Yevgeniy Chazov concluded.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1410

TASS INTERVIEWS U.S. PROTESTOR AT NEVADA TEST SITE

LD211937 Moscow TASS in English 1754 GMT 21 May 86

[Text] New York May 21 TASS--TASS correspondent Antoliy Lazarev reporting.

We have spent three days on the territory of the nuclear test range in Nevada in a bid to head off another nuclear device test, code-named Panamint, Larry Tasaday, one of the people who took part in the daring action of protest, told the TASS correspondent in a telephone interview.

Four more activists from the Rocky Mountain peace center took part in the protest.

Unfortunately, he went on to say, we could not attain our aim: The police arrested us on charges of trespassing on federal property.

We were put in jail outside the nuclear test range but later released on bail, Tasaday said.

Our action is called upon to encourage other Americans to stage actions of protest against the mad policy of the Reagan administration which continues the nuclear arms buildup and conducts nuclear weapon tests for that purpose, the anti-war campaigner emphasized.

Such demonstrations are all the more urgent and important since the Soviet Union extended its unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests till August 6, 1986. We believe that this is a critical time for Washington, the time when the sincerity of its statements concerning the 'striving for peace' will be put to the test.

The United States should join in the Soviet moratorium, Larry Tasaday emphasized.

He said he regarded that move as a first step toward ridding mankind of the threat of nuclear war and toward the abolition of nuclear weapons the world over.

Many Americans, he said, support the Soviet initiative and believe that it is a manifestation of true humanism of the Soviet state. We share the well-founded concern of the government and the people of the USSR over the intensifying arms race and the continuing nuclear testing. Despite arrests, we will carry on with our efforts to ensure a peaceful future for the world, Larry Tasaday said.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1410

RELATED ISSUES

TASS: POSSIBILITY OF WINNING WAR GUIDES U.S. STRATEGY

LD041745 Moscow TASS in English 1727 GMT 4 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow June 4 TASS — TASS Military News Analyst Vladimir Chernyshev writes:

Of late, the U.S. Administration has taken a number of steps obviously designed to whip up the arms race in every way, to heighten international tension, and deliberately to worsen Soviet-U.S. relations. Karsten Voigt, a prominent figure of the Social Democratic Party of Germany (SPD), has described as a 'black day' to disarmament May 22, when when NATO's military bodies at Washington' bidding took a decision sanctioning the start of the production of a new-generation chemical weapon in the USA -- the binary round. The same definition can be given also of May 27 when President Reagan announced a virtual refusal of the United States to be bound subsequently by the limits of the Soviet-U.S. treaty documents on the limitation of strategic offensive arms -- the 1972 interim agreement and the 1979 SALT-2 treaty.

The U.S. 'star wars' machine is gathering momentum. Nuclear explosions which are conducted one after another in Nevada sound like an overt challenge to the peoples of all continents.

By destroying the foundation of the process of limiting and reducing arms and by breaking the material curbs on the arms race, Washington enhances the nuclear and chemical threat to the world and is preparing a 'star wars' threat for it. The egoistic, imperial ambitions of the U.S. military-industrial complex are now placed by the present U.S. Administration above the interests of mankind. The administration did not reduce any of the arms programs. In point of fact it has galvanized all the military programs of previous administrations, the programmes which were removed from the agenda for some or other reasons. The U.S. administration has worked out and begun to implement an all-embracing programme for the construction of powerful arms in all the components of the U.S. strategic "triad". The U.S. President has just sent to Congress a message demanding full support for the Administration's budget request for the 1987 fiscal year intended for the implementation of the programmes for the 'strategic modernization' of America. The sum requested by the Administration (320,000 million dollars) is known to have been cut by the Senate down to 301,000 million dollars and by the House of Representatives -- down 285,000 million dollars. This gave rise to strong discontent in the White House and the Pentagon. They do not intend to put up even with such cuts inconsiderable as they are as compared with the overall amount of the requested military expenditures.

The U.S. administration needs a huge military budget in order to go ahead at an accelerated pace with the realisation of programmes for the militarisation of outer space, for "chemical rearmament" of America, of the development and deployment of new strategic offensive arms — "MX and "Midgetman" ICBM's, heavy bombers with cruise missiles on board. "Trident" missile-carrying submarines, and so on.

All these actions by Washington are in obvious contradiction with the important provisions recorded in the joint Soviet-U.S. document on the results of the summit meet meeting in Geneva, and first of all, with the pledge not to seek military superiority, and the statement that nuclear war cannot be won and should never be fought.

Instead, all the above-mentioned actions of the U.S. Administration are closely dovetailed with the 'counter-vailing' strategy between the USA and the USSR, the strategy which the administration announced in June 1981. Those actions indicate that, despite the peaceable rhetoric of the U.S. leadership, the White House and the Pentagon are still guided by precisely that strategy which admits of a possibility of winning a victory in a nuclear war and of achieving military superiority over the Soviet Union.

It is time, at last, for the U.S. leadership to abandon its intentions to continue to threaten mankind with a nuclear sword and to keep the world in the trap of [word indistinct]-out destruction. It is time to take a sober view of the realities of the nuclear and space age. The U.S. side should cherish no illusions that it will manage to achieve military advantages for itself at the expense of the security of others. It is time to get over the gulf separating myths from reality and to move on from destruction to creation.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1414

CPSU'S VOROTNIKOV ON U.S. RESPONSE TO SOVIET INITIATIVES

PM021102 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 May 86 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Comrade V.I. Vorotnikov's Speech"]

[Excerpts] Ulaanbatar, 28 May--Today the 19th MPRP Congress was addressed by the head of the CPSU Delegation V.I. Vorotnikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, who was warmly greeted by those present. He said: Esteemed Comrade Batmonh! Esteemed comrades! On behalf of all our country's Communists and working people, the CPSU delegation wholeheartedly greets the 19th MPRP Congress. We wish the congress delegates successful and fruitful work.

We and our comrades-in-arms in the socialist community share the view that life demands that cooperation be not only expanded but also raised to a qualitatively new level. The CPSU declared from the rostrum of the 27th party congress its determination to do everything it can in this respect. Comrade J. Batmonh's report and the delegates' speeches at your congress confirm that this is also the consistent line pursued by the party of the Mongolian Communists. Past and present experience indicates that by pooling our efforts and strengthening our multifaceted mutual ties we augment socialism's strength and enable it to influence the course of world events more actively and counter the aggressive imperialist policy more effectively.

The need for this is felt acutely today when the situation in the world has become particularly tense and dangerous. The source of this tension is the adventurist imperialist policy. The actions of the present U.S. Administration are characterized by imperial ambitions and crude disregard for the rights of other peoples. In its desire to destroy the military-strategic equilibrium that has ben established in the world arena, imperialism is escalating the arms race, preparing to extend it to space, and irresponsibly toying with the fate of millions of people.

The paramount aim of the CPSU's international acitivity is to provide the Soviet people and our friends and allies with the possibility of working in conditions of lasting peace and freedom and to remove the threat of a new world war that is hanging over the planet.

The fundamental principles of an all-embracing system of international security formulated by the 27th CPSU Congress are imbued with profound concern for peace and reflect a truly constructive approach to the complex problems of international life. Fulfilling the behest of the congress, we will continue to struggle with unremitting energy for the implementation of the comprehensive program for the elimiation of mass destruction weapons, put forward in the statement of Comrade M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, of 15 January this year.

Of late our country has advanced a number of specific new proposals relating to arms limitation and disarmament, the strengthening of security in Europe, and the Soviet-American talks in Geneva. As you know, speaking on Soviet television recently, Comrade M.S. Gorbachev announced the extension of our unilateral moratorium on nuclear weapon tests until 6 August. Throughout the world this step was received as yet another convincing manifestation of our sincere concern for the fate of peace and our desire to avert the threat of nuclear war.

All the Soviet Union's actions are imbued with a striving for mutually acceptable and honest accords that would take the interests of both sides into account. We are seeking no advantages for ourselves and we are not trying to outwit our partner.

Unfortunately, the U.s. Administration and its NATO allies are not reciprocating. No matter what proposals we put forward, they are immediately rejected, for which any far-fetched pretext is considered suitable. Instead of a constructive attitude toward our propsals, counterproposals are put forward that pursue unilateral advantages in the military-strategic sphere and complicate the quest for accords.

In other words, comrades, the U.S. Administration does not want serious talks, it does not want a relaxation of tension, it does not want disarmament. This is graphically borne out also by the recent provocative and defiant actions of the U.S. military in various parts of the world, the proliferation of efforts aimed at the militarization of space, their aggression against Libya, their unceasing provocations against Central American countries, and the fueling of tension in the Near and Middle East.

However, no matter how hard they try to provoke us, we will not abandon our principled foreign policy course. We are confident that the future belongs to the policy of peace and cooperation between poeples. We are convinced that all the controversial questions which arise in international life can and must be resolved by peaceful means at the negotiating table. This, and only this approch accords with mankind's natural striving for self-preservation and with the interests of the peoples of all continents.

Here, in Ulaanbaatar, in the heart of the Asian Continent, I would like to dwell especially on the situation in the Asian and Pacific region. In this vast region there are quite a few involved political tangles and "flashpoints." It is no secret that imperialism feeds on contradictions and differences between Asian countries. It has a vested interest in Asia and the Pacific and Indian Ocean remaining a constant source of tension and a sphere of military confrontation. This is why it is kindling conflicts here.

All this is directly damaging the national interests of the peoples of the region who are seeking economic and social progress in conditions of peace, independence, and mutual cooperation. The political will to tackle long overdue problems is strengthening in Asian countries. And it seems natural that their solution should be sought by pooling the constructive efforts of all the states of the region for the common good, rather than by individual countries alone or within the framework of isolated groups of countries.

Speaking about this, I would like to note with special satisfaction the increasing activity in the region of the Mongolian People's Republic. Your peace-loving efforts are meeting with increasingly broad response. It is impossible to ignore, for instance, to what extent the idea of a convention on mutual nonaggression and nonuse of force in relations between the states of Asia and the Pacific Ocean put forward by the MPRP accords with the spirit of the times and the interests of peoples.

As for the Soviet Union, we propose a comprehensive step-by-step approach to the solution of the region's problems. It is not, of course, a question of forcing a ready-made formula of all-Asian security on anyone, but rather an invitation to take part in its joint elaboration. This path does not, of course, guarantee the immediate solution of all the problems that have accumulated in Asia. However, it will undoubtedly promote mutual understanding and facilitate the quest for accords, and it will make it possible to make confrontation in various parts of the continent less acute and to stabilize the situation there.

In our view, the principles of Bandung which have lost none of their topicality, as well as the generally known initiatives advanced by Vietnam, other fraternal Indochinese states, and India, and the Soviet proposals for confidence-building measures in the Far East cout, for instance, become elements of a broad and constructive concept of security in Asia. Of great importance is the DPRK initiative aimed at improving the situation on the Korean peninsula and transforming it into a nuclear-free zone. The steps taken by the Government of Afghanistan with a view to achieving a political settlement of the situation around that country accord harmoniously with the united concept of peace on the Asian continent.

We also regard our program for the elimination of nuclear and chemical weapons by the end of the current century as a contribution to the elaboration of a common approach to the establishment of a system of secure and lasting peace in Asia. People in the Soviet Union proceed from the premise that socialist China, too, could play a significant role in the establishment of goodneighborly relations in the region.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1414

FURTHER ON NAVAL DISCUSSION AT UN DISARMAMENT COMMISSION

LD200943 Moscow TASS in English 0700 GMT 20 May 86

[Text] New York, 20 May (TASS)--The delegations of Bulgaria, the German Democratic Republic and the Soviet Union called for an early opening of talks and consultations on planning specific steps to limit the operations of naval fleets, reduce naval arms and spread confidence measures to the seas and oceans. The three delegations submitted a working document for consideration to the current session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission here. The document took note of the need for reversing the continuing escalation of the race in naval arms.

The document said in part that the delegations of Bulgaria, the German Democratic Republic and the Soviet Union welcomed the beginning of consultations on that matter in the United Nations Disarmament Commission. [word indistinct] of the urgent measure agreement could be reached on the non-expansion of naval operations of the states in the regions through which the busiest shipping routes pass and where the possibility of conflict situations is most probably--the Indian, Atlantic or Pacific oceans, the Mediterranean Sea or the Persian Gulf.

With regard to one of such regions--the Mediterranean where dangerous developments are taking place--the sides could come to terms on the application of agreed confidence measures, on the reduction of the armed forces, on the withdrawal of ships carrying nuclear weapons, on renouncing the deployment of such weapons on the territory of the non-nuclear Mediterranean countries and on the nuclear powers pledging not to use such weapons against any Mediterranean country which does not permit their deployment on its territory.

At the first phase, the document emphasized, no limitations of any kind would be imposed on the naval operations and naval arms of the Mediterranean states. As to further steps to enhance security in that region, they could be defined with due account of the Soviet proposals set forth in the 15 January statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and aiming for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

The People's Republic of Bulgaria, the GDR and the USSR believe that the realization of the Soviet Union-formulated nuclear disarmament program and the proposal on working out fundamental elements of a comprehensive system of international security would undoubtedly block off ways of the race in any arms, including naval arms.

The working document emphasized that if the United States withdrew its fleet from the Mediterranean Sea the same would be done simultaneously by the Soviet Union which was prepared to open talks on that matter without delay.

Such regional measures, as the transformation of the Mediterranean into a zone of stable peace and cooperation, the transformation of the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace and the implementation of measures to strengthen peace and security in the Persian Gulf would be of positive importance, the document said.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1414

RELATED ISSUES

TASS: UN DISARMAMENT HEAD HOLDS PRESS CONFERENCE IN MOSCOW

LD261126 Moscow TASS in English 1104 GMT 26 May 86

[Text] Moscow, 26 May (TASS)--Jan Martenson, under-secretary-general of the United Nations and head of the UN department for disarmament affairs, held a press conference in Moscow today.

He recalled that in 1982 the United Nations had a second special session devoted to disarmament which launched the world disarmament campaign. The idea behind this campaign is to inform the world public about the aims and goals of the United Nations in the field examined.

The kind of ultimate goal in all this is to try to assist in creating a constructive, realistic and well-informed public opinion in all countries, that could have bearing on politicians to act in the field of disarmament.

The under-secretary-general said that in its work the United Nations had established five main constituencies. These are parliamentarians, the non-governmental organizations, the media, the research institutes and educational communities.

"We live in the extremely dangerous world... the combination of explosives... is more than one million Hiroshima bombs. We have also a dangerous situation in the field of conventional weapons. Since 1945 there have been something like 150 conflicts in the world with a death toll--the majority of whom are civilians--about 20 million people".

The annual military expenditure in the world is roughly equivalent to the entire debt burden of developing countries.

Jan Martenson expressed high appreciation of the program of complete elimination of nuclear weapons by 2000 put forward by the Soviet Union and described it as extremely important and all-embracing. He also highly appreciated the prolonging by the explosions till 6 August this year.

The UN under-secretary-general recalled that at the meeting in Geneva the Soviet and American leaders had expressed confidence that a nuclear war must never take place and that there can be no winners in it.

We should bring home this idea to the whole of mankind. Apart from it, no country can resolve its economic problems and at the same time spend enormous resources to the arms race. He pointed out the growing role of world public opinion which had turned into a powerful influential force in the struggle for peace, against a thermonuclear catastrophe.

Answering the question about the future of the United Nations organization, he emphasized that the UN was an instrument of peace. However, one should take into consideration that it is operating as effectively as it is permitted by its member states. One should not forget that the UN is the expression of the collective will of all its member states, the place where they can freely express their opinion irrespective of the size of the country. This is why he believes that there is a future for the UN.

Jan Martenson positively assessed the UN regional conference within the framework of the world disarmament campaign that was held in Tbilisi. He expressed gratitude to the Soviet Government, public organizations and the people of the USSR for assistance and cooperation.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1414

TASS ON PROPOSED UN CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT, DEVELOPMENT

LD031153 Moscow TASS in English 1052 GMT 3 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow June 3 TASS — TASS Political News Analyst Askold Biryukov writes:

Arming instead of development or disarmament for development? This is how the question stands now in view of a prospect for the convocation of an international conference this summer on interconnection between disarmament and development. It must be recalled that a decision to call such a conference was unanimously taken at the 40th session of the U.N. General Assembly in December last year. In accordance with that decision, the conference is to consider a wide range of matters concerning the adverse effect which the on-going arms race and the growth of military expenditures have on the socio-economic situation in the world. The conference is also to set about looking for ways to release additional resources for creative purposes, particularly those in the interests of the developing countries, resultant of the implementation of disarmament measures.

A special committee began preparations for the conference and has done by now a certain amount of work in this direction.

There is no doubt that an all-round discussion at a high political level of the adverse effects of the arms race, and the problem of switching over for creative purposes the huge funds, which are now being spent on military programmes, would serve the interests of the whole of mankind, of all peoples that strive to solve their socio-economic problems. It was not fortuitous that the convocation and goals of the conference were welcomed at the April session of the Coordinating Bureau by the foreign ministers of non-aligned countries in Delhi.

They urged all countries to take part in the international conference and to contribute to its being a success.

The foreign ministers pointed out its being of particular importance to find ways to rectify the existing situation when hundreds of billions of dollars, which is equivalent to approximately $1.5 million per minute, are spent every year on weapons, which is in sharp contrast to poverty and, in some cases, to abject poverty in which two thirds of the world's population live. The participants in the session in Delhi also expressed conviction that the economic and social consequences of the arms race hampered the establishment of a new economic order.

However, the U.S. Administration, which is going ahead with building up nuclear arsenals and preparing for 'star wars', perceived danger to the U.S. adventuristic militarist course in the convocation of the conference. Washington got frightened with the very prospect that the spiraling up of the arms race by the United States and the attempt at frustrating a political dialogue and talks on disarmament by the USA would be strongly criticised at the forum. Then, Washington decided to sabotage the work of the Preparatory Committee. In April the United States officially stated its refusal to attend the conference. Such a stand cannot be interpreted otherwise than an overt unwillingness of Washington to consider and tackle the problem of disarmament in a constructive spirit and to contribute to overcoming the difficulties which are being experienced by the developing countries.

Under Washington's pressure, Western countries, too, began to show an obvious unwillingness to engage in coordinating a draft final document of the conference within the framework of the preparatory committee. Some of them even came forward with a proposal to postpone the convocation of the conference 'in view of the revealed differences.' But differences in approaches to the problem which was formulated at the 40th session of the U.N. General Assembly, cannot and should not become a ground or a cause for renouncing a search for mutually acceptable solutions. The conference, for which the international community declared unanimously, should be convened as scheduled in order to give an impulse to active steps to end the arms race, to reduce arms, to cut down military expenditures, and to use the fruits of work exclusely for creative purposes and for a solution to global problems which become aggravated.

It is believed in the Soviet Union that the militarism-imposed principle of arming instead of development should be replaced by an oppositive order of things: disarmament for development. It is necessary to secure that every measure aimed at limiting and reducing arms, and every step along the lines of freeing the world from nuclear and other weapons should not only bring more security to the peoples but should also make it possible to allocate more funds to improve people's living conditions.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1414

USSR HOSTS SCIENTISTS CONFERENCE AGAINST NUCLEAR WAR

Fedoseyev Preview

PM281400 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 27 May 86 Second Edition p 3

[TASS correspondent L. Chernenko article: "Curbing the Forces of War"]

[Text] Moscow -- Scientists are particularly aware of the scale of the danger concealed in nuclear arsenals and acutely realize the irreversible destruction that would be caused by a nuclear conflict. That is why they devote the full force of scientific evidence, the cogency and accuracy of their arguments, the activeness of their life stance, and their passion as researchers to the defense of peace. This movement is becoming increasingly prestigious and effective. The second All-union Conference of Scientists on the Problems of Peace and the Prevention of Nuclear War, which opens in Moscow 27 May, is an important stage in the peace movement.

At the conference it is planned to discuss the fundamental questions of preventing a nuclear war, ensuring lasting peace, and developing international cooperation, Academician P.N. Fedoseyev, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, told this TASS correspondent. Delegations of scientists from the union republics and scientific centers of the RSFSR and more than 100 foreign guests will take part.

The current year -- the International Year of Peace -- has been marked by the Soviet Union's major peace-loving initiatives and actions. The comprehensive international security program put forward and substantiated in the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 15 January statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and in his speeches on Soviet television envisages the complete elimination of nuclear weapons and other means of mass destruction before the year 2000.

The conference, which will be held within the framework of the International Year of Peace, will examine in detail all aspects of this program and define scientists' role in propagandizing and implementing it. The impermissibility of the militarization of space, peaceful international cooperation in this sphere, the possible consequences of a nuclear war, topical aspects of disarmament, and the global problems of civilization represent the range of questions the participants will discuss.

Naturally, the conference will devote great attention to international scientific cooperation and the peaceful application of the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution, particularly the utilization of nuclear power. Soviet scientists and their foreign colleagues were profoundly interested in the proposals expressed in M.S. Gorbachev's speech on Soviet television for closer cooperation among all states engaged in nuclear power generation. The Chernobyl disaster, like nuclear power station accidents in other countries, requires joint efforts particularly. Unfortunately, ruling circles in Western countries are obstructing the development of contacts between scientists in different states. But scientists worldwide are vitally interested in gearing scientific achievements to the good of their people and the good of mankind. We hope, P.N. Fedoseyev noted, that exchanges of opinions with our foreign colleagues will be useful and fruitful.

Under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution, when science is becoming an increasingly direct productive force, the role of scientists is naturally growing and their influence on the course of public affairs increasing. It is researchers' specialist knowledge in various spheres of science and technology that increases their role not only in consultations but in resolving important problems. The potential of scientists influence in resolving the problems of war and peace depends, of course, on the policy of the ruling parties and the class nature of the states.

Whereas in the socialist countries scientists' ideas and aspirations coincide with party and state policy, in the Western countries scientists' peace-loving intentions and actions run counter to the ruling elites' policies, which are built on the concept of force and military domination. That is why in capitalist states scientists have to work under difficult conditions in order to defend peace. Yet nonetheless, scientists' opinions are getting through to people's hearts and minds. The weight of those opinions is growing. Soviet scientists highly value their foreign colleagues' noble role and support all these peace-loving initiatives. We can see that the movement of the scientific community against war is becoming increasingly mass-based in nature in the West.

At a time when scientific thought is opening up unusually powerful and at the same time threatening sources and types of energy scientists' responsibility for the results of the application of their discoveries, which should be used solely for people's benefit, is also growing. Scientists must also be clearly aware of how great their responsibility is in the event of science being abused for military purposes whose implementation would lead to innumerable disasters for all mankind and could threaten life on earth itself. The main concern of scientists and of all socialist society is the people's good and the development and galvanization of the human factor. Many different scientific institutions are studying these questions. A Scientific Council for Human Problems has been set up at the USSR Academy of Sciences to coordinate this research.

The weight of Soviet scientists' opinions and proposals on questions of the defense of peace and the peaceful utilization of scientific achievements rests on the high prestige of domestic science, which is the most advanced in the world in many highly important avenues. The first nuclear power station and the first steps in peaceful space exploration all show the peaceful aspirations of Soviet science. And the list of such achievements is growing.

Fedoseyev Addresses Group

LD270640 Moscow TASS in English 0610 GMT 27 May 86

[Text] Moscow, 27 May (TASS)--Scientists regard it as their duty to facilitate the realization of the loftiest dream of the peoples--to preclude war forever from the life of society and assert a lasting and firm peace, Petr Fedoseyev, vice president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, has declared.

He addressed the second conference of Soviet scientists on problems of peace and prevention of nuclear war, which opened in Moscow today.

159 scientists from 47 countries have arrived to attend the forum.

Noting that the conference was devoted to the U.N.-designated International Year of Peace, Academician Fedoseyev stressed that the threat looming large over mankind through the fault of the militaristic circles had never been so ominous as today.

But never before has there been so real opportunies to preserve and consolidate peace. 1986 was marked by the USSR's drastic initiatives and actions in shaping a new international climate and handling the global task of eliminating weapons of mass annihilation.

The USSR favoured the establishment of a comprehensive stystem of international security and development of international cooperation in peaceful uses of achievements of scientific and technical revolution, especially in the safe utilization of atomic energy, Fedoseyev pointed out.

Academy President on Issues

LD270644 Moscow TASS in English 0634 GMT 27 May 86

[Text] Moscow May 27 TASS -- "A nuclear war is a threat to world civilization. Only real disarmament and universal security can be the reliable foundation of preserving peace," Anatoliy Aleksandrov, president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, has declared.

He today addressed the second all-union conference of scientists on problems of peace and prevention of nuclear war.

The recent misfortune in Chenobyl, the academician stressed, and the previous accidents at atomic power plants in several countries graphically showed the inter-relationship and inter-dependence of today's world and the universal objective interest in ensuring effective control over the formidable force of the atom.

"This is an absolute imperative of preventing nuclear war with all its disastrous consequences."

Academician Aleksandrov emphasised that technical systems, which were getting ever more sophstisticated, could not ensure military superiority and victory in nuclear war. But they were shaking strategic stability and increasing the risk of error, malfunction and miscalculation threatening to grow into uncontrollable and irreversible consequences.

"Mankind cannot remain a hostage of accident. The threat looming over the world should be averted, radically averted. Achieving this objective is impossible by spiralling the arms race and transferring it into outer space," Aleksandrov pointed out.

Velikhov on Limited War, SDI

LD272039 Moscow TASS in English 1715 GMT 27 May 86

[Text] Moscow May 27 TASS -- The nature of modern weapons is such that even the most powerful and refined defences cannot ensure the security of any country, stated Yevgeniy Velikhov, vice-president of the USSR Academy of Sciences. He spoke in Moscow today at the Soviet scientists' current all-union conference which is dealing with the problems of peace and the prevention of nuclear war.

Academician Velikhov pointed out the coincidence of the views of scientists of various countries on key problems of our times. He said, in particular, that U.S. colleagues from the Federation of American Scientists are also of the opinion that nuclear war would be the greatest disaster to mankind and that there exists no effective defence against a nuclear attack.

The "limited" war concept, he went on to say, does not hold water, since a nuclear disaster, happening, for example, in the Northern Hemisphere, would inevitably move under the influence of atmospheric processes to the other side. Therefore a nuclear war would have no living witnesses, and it would affect all countries.

A particular danger, Academician Velikhov said, would be posed by a transfer of the arms race to outer space. Soviet and American scientists independently arrived at the same opinion: The U.S. plans for the development of an impenetrable anti-missile defence system with space-based elements are an illusion. The idea is not backed up by any modern scientific or technical notions. "It is quite evident to us that the development of an anti-missile defence system is oriented towards ensuring the impunity of a first strike on the part of the United States. The SDI programme", Velikhov explained, "is part and parcel of Washington's overall military plan based on an offensive nuclear strategy".

Dobrynin Conference Report

PM291100 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 May 86 First Edition p 4

[Unattributed report: "Into the 21st Century Without Nuclear Weapons; All-Union Conference of Scientists" -- capitalized passages printed in boldface]

[Text] The planet's inhabitants are now facing the question of war and peace in all its urgency because the might of the weapons stockpiled on earth has never before been so destructive and so threatening for mankind. Scientists are now particularly aware of the danger contained in the arsenals of nuclear weapons. A sincere desire to examine objectively the complex and dangerous situation in which mankind finds itself and a firm intention to strengthen the scientific flank of the antiwar movement unites the participants of the Conference of Scientists on the Problems of Peace and the Prevention of Nuclear War, which opened in Moscow 27 May.

The conference presidium consists of leaders of the USSR Academy of Sciences, eminent scientists from abroad, and representatives of international scientific organizations.

The conference was opened by Academician P.N. Fedoseyev, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences. This year, he said, which is the International Year of Peace, has been marked by major peace-loving initiatives and actions by the Soviet Union. The all-embracing program for international security put forward by the 27th CPSU Congress and later developed in statements by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee envisages the complete elimination of nuclear weapons and other means of mass destruction by the year 2000.

Academician A.P. Aleksandrov, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, delivered an introductory speech to the participants in the scientists' antiwar forum. A reliable foundation for the preservation of peace, he said, can be provided only by real disarmament and universal security.

Technical systems, which constantly increase in complexity, cannot ensure military superiority and victory in a nuclear war, but they do shake strategic stability and increase the probability of mistakes, malfunctions, and errors fraught with uncontrollable and irreversible consequences. Mankind cannot remain a hostage to chance, and therefore the danger hanging over the world must be eliminated, and eliminated radically.

A report entitled "For a Nuclear-Free World by the 21st Century" was delivered by A.F. Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. He conveyed to the participants in the conference a greeting from M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and his wishes for fruitful work and success in all the activity of scientists aimed at creating a nuclear-free world, a world rid of the threat of nuclear war and freed from nuclear weapons.

Recently, the speaker said, M.S. Gorbachev has repeatedly addressed the question of the role and position of science and scientists in the cause of preserving peace and life itself on earth. The leadership of our party and our country highly values the contribution made by scientists not only to exploring nature's secrets, but also to joint efforts designed to protect mankind from the unwise use of the achievements of science, and particularly to the cause of preventing war.

Soviet people are profoundly gratified by the fact that our country was the initiator of a radical program to deliver the world from nuclear arms by the end of this century. The 15 January statement by M.S. Gorbachev, the foreign policy initiatives formulated in the Central Committee Political Report to the 27th party congress, and the USSR's proposals put forward after the congress -- all this, we believe, inspires people's hearts with new hope.

Our comprehensive plan offers an opportunity for the total elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere in the world under strict international verification [kontrol]. Likewise for the elimination of chemical weapons, their stockpiles, and the industrial base for their production, as well as for a ban on the creation [sozdaniye] of non-nuclear weapons based on new physical principles and closely resembling other types of mass destruction weapons in terms of their casualty-producing capability. Now these proposals have been supplemented by the proposal to reduce conventional arms and armed forces throughout the European zone, from the Atlantic to the Urals.

The historic importance of the new Soviet proposals is obvious. These proposals are realistic because they do not pursue the objective of gaining any unilateral advantages for the Soviet Union, and they accord with the fundamental interests not only of our own country and our allies and friends, but also of the United States, the NATO countries, and people all over the world.

It is our profound belief that the nuclear arms race does not ensure international stability but, on the contrary, helps to constantly intensify the threat of nuclear conflict. This becomes particularly obvious if you consider the qualitative aspect of the arms race.

Rapid changes in military technology lead objectively to the emergence of weapons and systems that can render the verification [kontrol] of arms limitation and reduction unbelievably difficult, and even impossible. Furthermore, they create a completely different situation by inexorably reducing decisionmaking time, leaving more and more decisions to machines and equipment, and thus, step by step, depriving political leaders even of the right to deliberate, discuss, and ponder.

The "Strategic Defense Initiative" program being implemented by the Reagan administration, which is a graphic example of a senseless "flight into technology" in the hope of reviving the former American advantage, presents a great danger to peace and the stability of military-strategic equilibrium.

Today I would like to recall that a large group of Soviet scientists was among the first to provide a weighty analytical evaluation of the U.S. "star wars" program. The Soviet scientists' "Appeal to All Scientists in the World," published in April 1983, said: "In reality, the attempt to create [sozdaniye] so-called 'defensive weapons' against the other side's strategic nuclear forces, as announced by the U.S. President, will inevitably lead to the emergence of yet another element strengthening the U.S. 'first strike' potential." Today, as we know, this opinion is shared by many thousands of scientists from all countries, including a large number of scientists and experts in the United States, the FRG, Britain, Australia, and Canada.

The Soviet response to the creation [sozdaniye] of a large-scale ABM system with space-based elements by the United States will be, as M.S. Gorbachev noted, citing our scientists' studies [razrabotki], efficient, cheaper, and capable of being implemented within a shorter time; moreover, this response will not necessarily take place in outer space. Nevertheless, we are consistently opposed to an arms race in space, A.F. Dobrynin said, primarily because we are perfectly aware of the dangerous consequences it may produce.

The champions of SDI use an argument aimed specifically at the scientific community to the effect that this program will supposedly ensure a new breakthrough in the sphere of technology and will stimulate the development of scientific thinking. But can progress in science and technology be achieved only by subordinating them to military goals? On the contrary, peaceful goals offer the broadest scope for scientific quest and the application of its results, and for man's benefit too. This is why the Soviet stance does not boil down to just an exposure of the "star wars" plans and a demonstration of the deadly nature of these plans. It also includes an important alternative constructive element -- peaceful cooperation in the exploration of outer space. This was precisely what M.S. Gorbachev spoke about at the meeting with the delegation from the Nobel Prize Winners Congress, emphasizing that we are in favor of a fundamentally new way to accelerate progress in science and technology.

The limitation and reduction of nuclear arms, the prevention of an arms race in space, and the transition to real disarmament measures would provide the main real and reliable instrument for strengthening strategic stability and reducing the military danger. It is necessary to agree honestly and in a businesslike fashion on specific measures to reduce, and later eliminate the threat of a nuclear war. To agree before it is too late.

Dwelling on the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva, A.F. Dobrynin emphasized that the Soviet Union has done and will continue to do everything in its power to ensure that the "Geneva spirit" is embodied in specific accords. On the other hand, Reagan's administration has yet to make a single gesture of goodwill in response, even a symbolic gesture.

Fortunately, by no means are all questions of world politics resolved in Washington. We are witnessing the emergence and affirmation of a new thinking, a new approach toward the problems of peace. They accord with the interests of every people and of the entire international community.

The interdependence of survival -- the unbreakable unity of the historical fate of all states in the world in the face of a possible nuclear conflict -- is of fundamental importance. This interdependence determines the need for a qualitatively new approach toward the problem of national security, an approach that is also one of the distinguishing features of the new political thinking.

Security in the world today is said to be based on fear of unavoidable retribution. We did not canonize this ultimately unreliable method of ensuring security. The USSR has never considered this position to be normal or acceptable. We have invariably advocated a reduction of the level of military confrontation with observance of the principle of equal security.

This is because the nature of today's weapons leaves no state the hope of defending itself solely by military-technological means, by creating even the most powerful defenses, for example. Thus the ideas of national and international security have become inseparable. "Speaking of relations between the USSR and the United States," the CPSU Central Committee Political Report emphasized, "security can only be mutual, and, speaking of international relations as a whole, it can only be universal. Supreme wisdom does not lie in being concerned solely about oneself, especially to the detriment of the other side. It is necessary for everyone to feel equally secure, because the fears and alarms of the nuclear age generate unpredictability in politics and in specific actions." The new political thinking presupposes a new and qualitatively higher level of flexibility in foreign policy, a readiness to make sensible compromises with one's partners in talks. Unfortunatley, such readiness is very often lacking among many political leaders in the West, primarily in the United States. Of course, a certain boldness is needed to depart from accepted views and concepts. But this boldness is already becoming a political reality, insofar as there are forces in the world that are either basing their foreign policy activity on the new thinking or are actively striving for it.

An obvious manifestation of this new thinking is provided by the unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions, which was recently extended once again by the Soviet leadership until 6 August. We again call on the U.S. state leaders to reach agreement on a nuclear test ban.

Of course, the process of shaping and affirming the new political thinking is a very difficult matter. Fierce clashes, sharp discussions, and painful differences are inevitable here. And yet, face to face with the threat of a nuclear apocalypse, mankind is beginning to perceive the simple truth: In order to survive, we must proceed in international relations not from narrowly perceived interests that place us in opposition to one another, but from our common interests and aspirations.

Scientists can and must do much to ensure that revolutionary transformations in thinking and in the approach toward questions of war and peace become reality. This offers a vast and very important field of activity for the representatives of all sciences. The representatives of Soviet science have already played a considerable role in revealing and analyzing major problems of international relations, international security, war and peace, and disarmament. Active cooperation has proved extremely fruitful in the serious research and explanatory work done by our leading scientists studying world politics, economics, and natural sciences. This fact has been displayed particularly vividly in the activity of the Committee of Soviet Scientists in Defense of Peace, Against the Nuclear Threat. A great international response has been evoked by the results of the joint activity of Soviet scientists and their colleagues abroad within the framework of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War Organization and the Pugwash Movement of scientists.

At the same time, we have a great need for new and even deeper studies on international and military-political issues, covering an increasingly broad range of problems. Essentially, life demands that this entire sphere of science be elevated to a qualitatively new level determined by the new political thinking. Above all it is a question of the major tasks confronting Soviet science and the scientific community in light of the concept, put forward by the 27th CPSU Congress, of creating an all-embracing system of international security, a system embracing all parts of the world and all spheres -- the military, political, economic, and humanitarian spheres whose totality represents, so to speak, all the stories of the edifice of international relations.

Hence the particular importance of an in-depth scientific analysis of political processes and their interconnected socioeconomic factors both on a broad international scale and on a local scale, in other words on the scale of scrupulous study of the specific national and regional forms of the development of these political processes.

Moreover now, under the conditions of the growing dynamism in all of international life, special and sometimes vital significance attaches to the skilled and, I emphasize, prompt evaluation of new and still emerging trends and their inherent dangers of potential.

Regarding MILITARY-POLITICAL sphere, it is obvious that here our attention must focus on resolving the totality of problems stemming from the task of blocking all channels via which armed conflicts develop.

First, there is the problem of norms of behavior by states, including their military activity. Second, the problem of reducing the military potential and of limiting and destroying the means of waging war, the problem of dismantling the material apparatus of war. Third, the problem of settling local conflicts, which are fraught with the danger of developing into a world war.

Our concept of an all-embracing system of international security organically includes also the ECONOMIC SPHERE. Research into the multifaceted problems connected with this issue is extremely valuable. What is important is the answer to the question: How do we see ways of settling the foreign debts of developing countries? Here is another and very important long-term problem: What are the priority needs toward which the funds released as a result of disarmament must be channeled? The duty of Soviet scientists is to work out in depth an integrated and comprehensive model of international economic security. Many problems are now appearing on a global level. These are the problems of the destruction of man's habitat, the quest for new sources of energy, the struggle against economic backwardness and famine, and the exploration of space and the world's oceans.

These are all global problems, and such problems demand, of course, global solutions. The most efficient solution, and quite possibly any solution at all of global economic problems can be achieved only by adding together national conditions on an international scale, via collective action by all members of the world community of nations. Such cooperation, of course, presupposes the elimination of all elements of discrimination and diktat in economic relations, normalization of the international situation, and reduction of the level of military confrontation. In other words, here too we come directly face to face with questions of war and peace, the main questions of our nuclear age.

And now, about the HUMANITARIAN SPHERE. Our concept of security is aimed at accomplishing the most humane of all the tasks facing mankind today: To prevent war and to guarantee the paramount natural human right -- to live under conditions of peace and freedom. There is, however, also a reverse connection here. It lies in the fact that the organization of truly civilized and proper norms of international contact and cooperation depends directly and immediately on the solution of many problems in the humanitarian sphere.

We attach the most serious importance to the problem of human rights, the speaker said, as a substantial factor of peace and international cooperation in this sphere. The only thing that is necessary is to free it from hypocrisy and speculation. No matter how paradoxical it may sound, those who occupy extremist positions in the arms race appear as the main champions of human rights. Anti-Soviet slander campaigns based on dense ignorance of human rights issues in our country are one of the favorite means used by world reaction to whip up international tension. But what does freeing this problem from speculation mean? It means not only rebuffing the speculators but also properly working out this problem in a constructive fashion. Different social systems have different criteria of human values, but the task is to find effective and realistic forms of international cooperation in this sphere and define the framework and criteria of such cooperation so as to rule out interference in internal affairs and ensure observance of the generally recognized principles of interstate relations.

The new thinking certainly does not mean abandonment of the classic analysis of problems of war and peace. It does, however, presuppose combining our ideals, in Marx' words, of real humanism with the democratic and peace-loving aspirations of all social strata acting in defense of the interests of all humanity, for the salvation of civilization.

We attach enormous significance, the speaker concluded to cooperation among scientists from different countries -- which has been growing stronger over the last few years -- in the struggle against the nuclear threat. We believe that, by augmenting their efforts, the scientists will remain in the vanguard of the fighters for mankind's survival, for its happiness, and for its future.

Forum Appeals to World Scientists

LD291646 Moscow TASS in English 1233 GMT 29 May 86

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS -- The participants at the Second National Conference of Scientists on the Problems of Peace and the Prevention of Nuclear War have addressed an urgent appeal to their colleagues throughout the world to use their authority and knowledge for stepping up efforts against the nuclear menace. The conference in Moscow, which is now in its third day, is being attended also by guests from 47 countries.

"Ruling circles in the West," the appeal said, "continue to pursue the tough course of confrontation and step up the arms race. This policy inevitably increases the probability of a nuclear catastrophe." "The alarming situation that has emerged in international relations calls for stepping up the world-wide struggle for peace," it said. "As persons studying the laws of development of nature and society, we scientists realize that the monstrous destructive force of modern weapons makes any defense, even with the help of the most powerful defense systems, impossible, that it is impossible to win not only a nuclear war, but also the arms race."

To ensure international security is a task facing all humanity, and it can be solved only by the joint efforts of all -- through the consistent curtailment of confrontation, limitation and reduction of armaments, settling regional conflicts, and ensuring reliable security for all. Complete cessation of nuclear weapons tests would be an important step towards nuclear disarmament, the appeal said. The scientists expressed the conviction that in conditions of a tense nuclear confrontation a new mentality is required in international relations. They said that an example of a new approach to the vital problems of our time has been demonstrated by the Soviet Union which has put forward a historic program for the complete elimination of weapons of mass annihilation by the end of this century. "Genuine disarmament and a stable peace would open broad vistas for uniting the efforts of states and peoples in the name of construction. A comprehensive development of international cooperation in every sphere of constructive activity -- from the exploration of outer space to research into the depths of the world ocean, from the protection of the environment to the peaceful utilization of atomic energy, from the elimination of hunger to the eradication of diseases -- is both possible and necessary," the appeal said.

Conference Ends

LD291632 Moscow TASS in English 1220 GMT 29 May 86

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS -- The Second National Conference of Scientists on the Problems of Peace and the Prevention of Nuclear War ended in Moscow today after issuing an appeal to the world's scientists to step up their efforts against the growing threat of a nuclear conflagration. The three-day meeting was attended by scientists from also 47 other countries. Together with Soviet colleagues they discussed ways of preventing outer space militarization, promoting international cooperation in outer space and achieving nuclear disarmament, limiting conventional arms, as well as the possible consequences of a nuclear war.

Delivering a report at the conference, Anatoliy Dobrynin, a secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, stressed that the USSR attaches much importance to the international cooperation of scientists to remove the nuclear threat. A report on the activities and plans of the Soviet scientists' committee for peace and against the nuclear threat was made by its chairman, Academician Yegveniy Velikhov.

Academician Petr Fedoseyev, a vice-president of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, said in the closing speech that the conference has demonstrated the increased political awareness of scientists. He noted that the attending physicians, chemists, mathematicians, and social scientists of different countries have spoken out for productive interaction in studying the pressing problems of war and peace.

Fedoseyev said the Soviet scientists appreciate the fact that the foreign guests have come out in support of the constructive peace initiatives of the USSR.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1414

RELATED ISSUES

JAPANESE FOREIGN MINISTER DISCUSSES SECURITY ISSUES IN MOSCOW

. Gorbachev on INF, SDI

LD301850 Moscow TASS in English 1845 GMT 30 May 86

[Excerpts] Moscow, 30 May (TASS)--Mikhail Gorbachev today received in the Kremlin Japan's Minister of Foreign Affairs Shintaro Abe who presented a message from Japan's Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone.

A wide range of problems of the international situation and bilateral relations were discussed. Shintaro Abe pointed to "a great role of the Soviet leadership in ensuring peace and international stability." Mikhail Gorbachev, pointing to Japan's vast potentials in resolving present-day world problems, set out the foundations of the Soviet Union's home and foreign policy which is oriented at giving an adequate answer to the demands of the nuclear age, of the scientific and technological revolution, to questions that stem from a complex nature, versatility, contradictoriness and inter-relationship of the world of today and which no one can evade any longer. Civilised attitudes, new political thinking, respect for legitimate interests of various states are needed for their solution.

When discussing the question of medium-range nuclear missiles on which Shintaro Abe spoke in the spirit of the "global approach" characteristic of the United States and NATO perplexity was expressed that it is insistently suggested that the Soviet Union eliminate medium-range nuclear missiles in the eastern part of the country, while the destruction of corresponding nuclear weapons targetted on the USSR from the territory of Japan and its littoral waters is not required of the Americans. Mikhail Gorbachev, nevertheless, suggested to the interlocutor looking jointly for the solution of this problem, too.

In answer to Shintaro Abe's request Mikhail Gorbachev set out the known Soviet stand about a new meeting with the President of the United States. It was said in this connection that the Soviet leadership is prepared to consider compromise solutions, but never will it make unilateral concessions: "We shall not yield either to political, or economic, or military pressure. Any agreement can be a result of constructive talks only".

The meeting can be productive if the approach to it, to the creation of the necessary atmosphere for its holding are rid of illusions about the motives for the Soviet interest in the meeting.

Serious concern was expressed over the intentions of the Japanese leadership to switch Japan's potential to the U.S. "star wars" plans, which cannot but affect the assessment of Japan's foreign policy intentions and Soviet-Japanese relations.

Points of contact and aspects of differences and disagreement were established as a result of a candid and benevolent conversation.

Mikhail Gorbachev asked Shintaro Abe to convey to the Japanese leadership, the Japanese people the fact that Soviet people are sincerely interested in good relations with it and wish the Japanese to view the Land of Soviets as a true neighbour, who has no perfidious designs and is prepared, honestly and by joint efforts, to seek the ways for a greater mutual understanding and interaction for the benefit of peace and in mutual interests.

Shevardnadze, Abe Speeches

PM041529 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jun 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Minister's Visit]

[Excerpts] Talks began in Moscow on 30 May between E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, and S. Abe, Japanese foreign minister. The guest is paying an official visit to our country at the Soviet Government's invitation.

On the same day E.A. Shevardnadze gave a luncheon in S. Abe's honor. Among those present were P.N. Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, A.F. Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, A.K. Antonov and G.I. Marchuk, deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers, ministers, chairmen of USSR State Committees, and other officials.

Y. Katori, Japanese ambassador to the USSR, and officials accompanying S. Abe were present at the luncheon for the Japanese side.

Speeches were exchanged. E.A. Shevardnadze said in his speech: At our recent meeting in Tokyo we noted with satisfaction the resumption of Soviet-Japanese political dialogue and agreed to continue it. Now, when you are in Moscow, Mr Minister, we are justified in saying that our dialogue is acquiring a stable character. That is in the interests of our countries and peoples and of world peace.

Now that we have met for the second time, it is extremely important that we determine in principle the further direction and content of our dialogue. In our view it must definitely be directed toward developing Soviet-Japanese relations in all spheres. But it is also obvious that our relations exist within the framework of certain realities and that those realities oblige us to view world politics in the broadest terms. The path from being just neighbors to becoming good neighbors is also part of the improvement of the international situation, the lowering of tension there, and the strengthening of the foundations of peace and world security. It is our firm conviction that present-day Japan could use its considerable weight and prestige to ensure that the realities of our time do not force us in different directions but instead promote the development of mutual understanding, confidence, and cooperation. Then some acute problems in our relations would appear differently.

I believe that our intensive search for ways to ensure a nuclear-free future for mankind should produce a powerful response among the Japanese in particular who have experienced for themselves the horror of the nuclear hell. And it is for that very reason that we hope for cooperation with Japan in implementing the program for the destruction of nuclear and chemical weapons set out in the 15 January 1986 statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Our peoples have a vitally important interest in the ending of nuclear explosions. The Soviet Union's position on this matter is well known. We not only consistently pursue the line of achieving an international accord on the general and complete banning of nuclear weapons tests but have also unilaterally imposed a moratorium on all nuclear explosions. Recently M.S. Gorbachev announced that this moratorium will operate until 6 August this year and offered President Reagan a special meeting.

By continuing its nuclear explosions the United States is also destroying the hopes of the peoples, including the Japanese people.

We are aware of the attempts that have been made to convince other countries that the level of their security will rise if the U.S. "star wars" program is implemented. Some take this on trust and even hurry to take part in it. It is for the Japanese side to make the appropriate decision, of course. I should like to draw attention, however, to the offensive character of space armaments, which are being developed as a more dangerous equivalent of nuclear weapons. The appearance of these armaments will reduce the level of all states' security and will make the continuation of the process of limiting and curtailing the arms race virtually impossible.

Judging by the U.S. Administration's recent statements, it is already trying to discard as quickly as possible all restrictions standing in the way of a nuclear and other arms buildup. We can see this from the example of Washington's attitude toward the SALT II treaty. And we are not dealing with imaginary violations of its provisions by the other side -- it is simply that the latest U.S. nuclear missiles hit and exceed the treaty's limits. The limits established by the treaty have become a hindrance. So they are trying to sweep it away. That is the "logic" of the militarist policy and the evolution of the politicians who refused to ratify this most important agreement in the strategic arms limitation sphere.

Such actions cause grave alarm throughout the world.

The point of all this is not to cause discord in Japan's relations with its allies. We simply proceed from the premise that any discussion with a neighbor presupposes complete frankness. Neighbours must be truthful with one another.

Yes, the neighborliness factor imposes many obligations. In particular, the obligation that we actively help to reduce tension in the Asian and Pacific regions, consolidate the security of all states in Asia, and establish broad, equitable, and mutually beneficial cooperation among them.

The recent Soviet Government statement on questions of the situation in the region made some specific observations We propose that an exchange of opinions begin as soon as possible among all interested countries of this part of the world. The most important thing is that these should be joint steps by the Asian and Pacific states to consolidate the foundations of peace in the region and strengthen security. We see them taking the

form of the broadest democratic discussion of all the questions of interest to the Pacific countries. Such a discussion may be organized in different forms -- collectively or on a bilateral basis. We are ready to exchange opinions with those who support our idea and with those who offer alternative solutions.

The Soviet Union and Japan could set an example and, of course, do quite a lot on a practical level. Other states would also gain from our cooperation.

In his reply speech, S. Abe expressed high appreciation of the regular consultations between the USSR and Japanese foreign ministers and expressed the hope that the present meeting would also be successful. He said that there are unresolved questions in Japanese-Soviet relations.

I would also like to note the significance of political dialogue between us not only for Japanese-Soviet relations but also for the international situation as a whole. In the present complex international situation the active conduct of high-level political dialogue between states with different social systems is vital to eliminate mutual distrust and solve existing problems. In the past 4 months Japan and the Soviet Union have had two opportunities to hold direct political dialogue and to conduct a frank and useful exchange of opinions on the most important questions of the present-day international situation. Our present talks are attracting considerable interest throughout the world. I also want to stress the importance of political dialogue between the Soviet Union and other states. I believe it highly desirable that dialogue, not confrontation, be the basis of international policy. In this regard I should like to note the fact that all the peoples of the world pin great hopes on political dialogue between the Soviet Union and the United States, which bear a great responsibility for the solution of such very important international problems as disarmament and arms limitation. In particular, the world's peoples would like a second U.S.-Soviet summit to be held as soon as possible.

The luncheon took place in a friendly atmosphere.

PRAVDA Carries Joint Communique

PM011614 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jun 86 First Edition p 4

["Soviet-Japanese Joint Communique"--PRAVDA headline]

[Excerpts] Japanese Foreign Minister Shintaro Abe was in the Soviet Union on an official vist 29 through 31 May 1986 at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

S. Abe was received by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. During a conversation held in a spirit of frankness there was a discussion of key problems of the international situation and also fundamental questions of the state and development prospects of Soviet-Japanese relations.

As part of a routine consultative meeting between E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and the USSR foreign minister, and Japanese Foreign Minister S. Abe, talks were held during which there was a discussion of questions of bilateral relations and also international problems of mutual interest.

Having noted the two sides' efforts to improve Soviet-Japanese relations, the ministers confirmed the interest in their further ongoing development on the basis of the principles of mutual benefit, equality, and noninterference in internal affairs. They stressed that such development is in keeping with the interests of both countries and would constitute a great contribution to the cause of strengthening peace and stability in Asia and throughout the world.

The ministers conducted a frank exchange of opinions on topical problems of the present-day international situation of mutual interest, including the safeguarding of peace and disarmament, and also certain regional problems.

They stressed the need for efforts to maintain and strengthen peace and expressed themselves in favor of the speediest reaching of accords on arms limitation and disarmament in the field of nuclear and conventional arms, envisaging a maximum lowering of the level of military confrontation.

The two sides advocated the need to continue efforts to ease tension in the Asia-Pacific Ocean region. In this connection they supported the steps to organize contacts and talks in the region and agreed on the need to create a situation promoting their further galvanization. They stressed that constructive assistance to the efforts of the countries located here on the basis of respect for their independence would serve the cause of peace and stability in this region of the world.

The ministers came to a unanimous opinion on the need to continue to promote the consolidation of positive trends in the development of the situation in the world by expanding bilateral dialogue on international problems.

The ministers confirmed their common understanding that nuclear power serves as an important source of energy for present and future generations of mankind and, taking into account the fact that ensuring its safety is a most important task, came to a unanimous opinion on the need for efforts at the international level, including seeking ways to increase the role and potential of the IAEA. The ministers also expressed themselves in support of the proposal to convene an authoritative international conference under IAEA auspices to discuss this entire set of questions and noted the advisability of including the United Nations and such international organizations as the World Health Organization and the United Nations Environment Program in such a conference.

The sides noted the businesslike and meaningful nature of the meetings and talks held during Japanese Foreign Minister S. Abe's visit, confirming their usefulness for both sides.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1414

SOVIET ARMY PAPER ADDRESSES ASIAN SECURITY ISSUES

PM081807 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Jun 86 Second Edition p 3

[A. Dmitriyev article: "For Security in Asia. The Policy of Peace Against the Policy of War"]

[Text] Mankind is living through an alarming and crucial stage of its development. Energetic actions aimed at improving the international situation are demanded today more than ever before. All this also applies directly to the Asian and Pacific region. Important processes are occurring there and they cannot but affect the USSR's stance as one of the greatest Asian powers, its friends and allies, and the interests of international peace and security.

The peoples of the region advocate the strengthening of good-neighborliness and friendship between Asian and Pacific countries and the pooling of their efforts in a joint quest for constructive solutions to security problems in Asia and the Pacific. There is, however, another noticeable trend, a negative one. Certain political circles in the United States and Japan do not perceive this region otherwise than as the arena of confrontation between different countries. The United States does not limit itself to just building up its military forces in the Pacific year by year. With Tokyo's help, it has embarked on knocking together a closed regional group, the so-called "Pacific Community," intending to transform it into yet another militarist bloc in the longer term.

As far as the USSR is concerned, it has suggested a broad program to improve the situation in Asia. It was formulated in the 23 April statement by the Soviet Government. "The Soviet Union," the statement emphasizes, "proposes... by means of bilateral and multilateral consultations to achieve the solution of disputed questions, better understanding, and strengthening of trust, and thus to create prerequisites for holding an all-Asian forum for the joint quest for constructive solutions."

The statement notes that a number of states have already put forward proposals aimed at consolidating security in the region. These proposals deserve the most serious examination.

An active struggle for all-Asian security is waged by the socialist countries and some nonaligned states.

The proposal to elaborate and conclude a convention on mutual nonaggression and nonuse of force in relations between Asian and Pacific states, put forward by Mongolia back in 1981, offered serious opportunities for the strengthening of peace. Mongolia's initiative is an organic part of the comprehensive approach to ensuring peace and security in Asia.

Mongolia proposes that a conference of Asian and Pacific states be convened for the purpose of elaborating the convention's stipulations. In addition to the countries from the region, it could be attended also by all states that are permanent members of the UN Security Council, which would boost the international guarantees for its effectiveness.

The convention proposed by People's Mongolia envisages reciprocal respect for the independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of all its signatories, inviolability of borders, noninterference in each other's internal affairs, nonuse of force or the threat of force, settlement of disputed problems exclusively by peaceful means, and development of mutually advantageous cooperation. Mongolia believes that the experience of the Bandung Conference and the well-known principles of peaceful coexistence proclaimed there must be taken into account during the elaboration of the convention. The convention could develop and consolidate the stipulations of the UN Charter and UN resolutions on questions concerning the renunciation of the use of force as applied to the specific situation in the region. An important place in the convention must be occupied by articles providing for energetic actions by signatory Asian and Pacific states to reduce military confrontation and curb the arms race, and for disarmament. J. Batmonh, general secretary of the MPRP Central Committee, emphasized in his report to the 19th MPRP Congress: "We will continue to make active efforts to implement this proposal in close conjunction with the constructive initiatives by other states in the region."

An improvement of the situation in the Far East would also further the implementation of comprehensive proposals put forward by the DPRK. They envisage, in particular, the withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Korea, the replacement of the armistice agreement by a peace treaty, the elaboration of a declaration on nonaggression between North and South, and the transformation of the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free zone, a zone of peace. The implementation of these initiatives opens the way to the country's unification on peaceful and democratic principles without outside interference.

The steps being taken by the SRV, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, and the PRK [People's Republic of Kampuchea] are directed toward fundamental improvement of the situation in Southeast Asia. These countries consistently follow a course of establishing good-neighborly relations with the ASEAN countries on the basis of fruitful dialogue, a course of creating a zone of peace, stability, and cooperation in the region.

The implementation of the DRA's proposals for political settlement of the situation around that country would be a highly important step in the cause of ensuring peace and security in Asia. The DRA's foreign policy is aimed at the strengthening of universal peace and the development of comprehensive international cooperation.

It is built on the principles of active and positive nonalignment and utmost strengthening of good-neighborly and mutually advantageous relations with friendly countries.

Guided by these principles, the DRA Government assigns an important position to the normalization of relations with neighboring countries. Talks are being conducted between the DRA and Pakistan through the personal representative of the UN secretary general. Total cessation of intervention and creation of guarantees for the nonresumption of any outside interference in the Republic's internal affairs -- this is the essence of the DRA's initiatives at these talks.

The PRC could make its contribution to the strengthening of Asian security. It is an important positive fact that the PRC, just like the USSR, has pledged not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. Despite differences in the USSR's and the PRC's approaches toward some international problems, the interests of both states objectively coincide when the issue concerns the struggle for peace and socialism, against the threat of nuclear war, against the arms race, and in particular against its transfer into space.

To transform the Asian and Pacific region into a zone of lasting peace and good-neighborliness -- this is the imperative of the time.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1414

GORBACHEV WRITES PREFACE TO SPEECH ANTHOLOGY PUBLISHED IN UK

LD061948 Moscow World Service in English 1610 GMT 6 Jun 86

[Excerpt] The book "Selected Speeches and Articles" by General Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Mikhail Gorbachev was brought out in English by the Pergamon Press publishers in Great Britain. The book contains a preface addressed to British readers by Mikhail Gorbachev, which reads as follows:

Naturally we have no intention to restrict ourselves to self-isolation. The Soviet Union is a member of the world community of nations, fully aware of the responsibility this fact involves. We proceed from the principle that an interdependent world, torn by contradictions yet integral in many ways, is taking shape through a dialectical conflict of opposites, feeling its way as it were. The formation of this interdependent and integral world is the essence of present-day social development and requires a new approach to international relations, a new philosophy of world politics. In other words, it is a question of working out a concept of international security to be adopted by all to enable us to retreat from the brink of nuclear war.

The realities of the nuclear age prove conclusively that military technology alone, even the most sophisticated kind, cannot guarantee national security. The advancement of weaponry is reducing to nil the significance of the vast oceans and enormous land distances, let alone mere straits.

Modern weapons have turned military power into a veritable boomerang, a nuclear one moreover, that is as sure to hit the thrower as his adversary. Therefore, concern for national security now demands the most scrupulous consideration of the security interests of other states. Mutual and equal security of all is imperative. This is our final conclusion.

The world is in a state of rapid change. Any social status quo is simply impossible. The existence of antagonism in our complex and many-faceted world makes it imcumbent on states to realized their common interest and most important of all to learn the science and art of peaceful coexistence; to exercise restraint and circumspection on the international scene; to behave in a civilized manner; that is, to observe the rules of correct international intercourse and cooperation.

In short, it is imperative to renounce resolutely and for good the ways of thinking and acting that have taken shape over the centuries on the princple that war, armed conflicts, and a contest in armaments are permissible in the conduct of national policy. It is impossible to win such a contest, let alone a nuclear war. Contradictions should be settled on the lines of peaceful competition alone.

Such is our concept of national security in broad outlines. It's a basis for the program of establishing a comprehensive system of international security advanced by the 27th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party.

I realize that the ideas we put forward at our party congress may give rise to counter-proposals. We should welcome peace initiations by other states. I want to note at the same time that our proposals mean more than the offer of a dialogue. There is a dialogue in progress although it's rather half-hearted at times.

We invite other countries, including Great Britian of course, to take part in a collective effort to avert the danger of nuclear or any other war. It is common duty of all states regardless of their social systems to deal effectively with the global problems facing mankind. Great Britain has long been a great power. Mankind owes to British genius many of its cultural achievements, great scientific discoveries, and brilliant inventions. I'm not just paying compliments. The history of Great Britian, like that of many other countries, doesn't consist merely of bright pages. However, our common concern for the future of mankind has come to the forefront.

I am confident that fruitful Soviet-British cooperation could greatly contribute to normalizing international relations and changing over from confrontation and suspicion to good-neighborliness and mutual trust. The Soviet Union is prepared for such a new deal. I avail myself of this opportunity to reaffirm the Soviet people's willingness to develop friendly ties with the people of Great Britian, and I wish them peace and prosperity, writes Mikhail Gorbachev, in the preface of his book "Selected Speeches and Articles" that's been published by Pergamon Press.

The presentation of the book to the British public was held at the USSR Embassy in Great Britain on Thursday. Addressing those present, USSR ambassador to Great Britian Leonid Zamyatin noted that Mikhail Gorbachev's book sets out in a well-reasoned way the strategic line of the CPSU, the foundation of the policy of the Soviet state. This is the most authoritative and precise reflection of the new political thinking.

At the presesentation of the book were members of the British Parliament, prominent representatives of the political and public circles, figures in science and culture.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1414

PRAVDA REVIEWS UK MP'S VISIT, NATO CW PLANS

PM031311 Mowcow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jun 86 First Edition p 5

[Boris Orekhov "International Review"]

[Excerpt] The past week contained many important events in the international policy sphere. One of the 52 weeks of the current year [as published], it reflected the complexity of the modern world, the multifarious and contradictory nature of the processes occurring in it, and the vital need for more efforts in the struggle for peace and the peoples' security.

In the socialist countries the period of ruling parties' routine congresses continues, congresses which demonstrate working peoples' unity and cohesion, successes in socialist building, and a commitment to the cause of peace and the peoples' security, and proclaim the struggle for the preservation and consolidation of peace as a main task.

This was also confirmed by the 19th MPRP Congress, which ended in Ulaanbaatar yesterday.

The line of preserving and consolidating world peace is reflected in the socialist countries' concrete foreign policy actions. This week the world was acquainted with the Soviet Government's statements on important international problems. The Soviet Union resolutely condemned NATO's chemical rearmament plans, which threaten fatal consequences for Europe and the whole world, and also the U.S. President's declared refusal to continue observing Soviet-U.S. legal treaty documents on the limitation of strategic offensive armaments -- the 1972 interim agreement and the 1979 SALT II treaty. The Soviet Union will continue to take every measure to reliably ensure the socialist community's security and will go on doing everything necessary to strengthen international security.

Taking Account of Lessons of the Past

The European Continent has traveled a long and difficult path. And it was here, in Europe, that people first understood that the modern world is too small, cramped, and fragile for a policy of strength, blackmail, threats, and military and other pressure to be pursued in it. Peace cannot be saved or preserved unless there is a resolute and irrevocable repudiation of the kind of thinking in which people viewed wars and military conflicts as acceptable and permissible.

Times have changed. There has been a fundamental change in the armaments that armies possess. The liberated energy of the atom has forced people to reexamine military-strategic concepts and to reexamine the very view of the armed conflict and war. Surely these changes affect no one more tangibly than the Europeans. After all, the fates of dozens of countries and peoples are closely bound together in Europe by geography and history. The European countries, unlike some others, are not separated by oceans thousands of miles wide. And the Europeans can preserve their home and make it more peaceful and secure by collective efforts, following the rational norms of international contact and cooperation.

A British parliamentary delegation headed by Lord Whitelaw recently visited the Soviet Union. In the course of the meetings held during this visit, which attracted broad attention not only in Britain but also throughout Europe, a common understanding of the need to halt the arms race and to seek mutually acceptable solutions to mankind's other problems in the modern complex, contradictory, but interconnected world was expressed.

The visit was useful. That is indicated by the fact that it confirmed the great potential for developing fruitful political dialogue between our country and Britain, economic and cultural ties between them, contacts in the parliamentary sphere, and contacts among people.

But I believe that the main questions examined during the visit to Moscow by Lord Whitelaw and his colleagues were those of ending nuclear tests. That is indeed where Britain could play a significant role. It is appropriate in this connection to think back to 1977 when, on a Soviet initiative, tripartite talks began involving the USSR, the United States, and Britain aimed at elaborating a treaty on a complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapons tests. During those talks, which lasted 3 years, considerable progress was achieved in the formulation of that treaty. But in November 1980 the United States, followed by Britain, refused to continue those talks. Now thought could be given to a Soviet-British initiative aimed at resuming the interrupted talks, especially since at that time the Soviet Union, the United States, and Britain were in agreement that nuclear weapons tests must be banned.

At the 26 May meeting with the British parliamentary delegation, M.S. Gorbachev put forward a new proposal addressed to Britain. Its essence was that if Britain officially decides to eliminate its nuclear weapons, the Soviet Union would be ready to reduce its nuclear potential by an equivalent amount. And if Britain simultaneously removed foreign nuclear weapons from its territory the Soviet Union would also guarantee that Soviet nuclear weapons would not be targeted on British territory and would never be used against Britain.

The Soviet Union thereby answered the question repeatedly raised in Britain, namely, what would the Soviet Union do if Britain eliminated its nuclear weapons? The answer, as we can see, is absolutely businesslike and specific.

The British parliamentarians called the Soviet proposals a useful new initiative and called the exchange of opinions that took place a positive contribution to the development of Soviet-British parliamentary ties. Now, clearly, we must wait for a reaction to the Soviet proposals from the British Government. Our new initiative is backed by a sincere desire to free the world from the nuclear threat and to clear the skies above Europe, whose history urges this. And when the West portrays Soviet initiatives in the disarmament sphere and persistence in the struggle for detente as "Moscow's machinations," as propaganda or utopia, or as a display of weakness, we regard all that as narrow-mindedness [organichennost] and an inability to understand the real state of affairs in the modern world. The essence of the matter is that the Soviet Union is aware of its high degree of responsibility for the fate of human civilization.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1414

SOVIET TALK SHOW: ASIAN SECURITY, INF, SALT, TEST BAN, CW

LD011735 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 1 Jun 86

["International Observers Roundtable" program, with Spartak Ivanovich Beglov, APN Political Observer; Yuriy Emmanuilovich Kornilov, TASS Political Observer; Vitaliy Sergeyevich Sobolev, All-Union Radio commentator]

[Excerpts] [Sobolev] Hello, comrades. The 19th Congress of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party [MPRP] was held last week. These highly important political events--congresses of the fraternal parties--have been a feature of the first half of this year. They are of the greatest importance, both to the peoples of their countries, and for the entire socialist community, and for the development of the international situation as a whole.

Under discussion at the MPRP congress was the strengthening of security in Asia, support for the Soviet initiatives in that sphere, and the position and initiatives of the Mongolian People's Republic itself, for example its proposal to set up machinery that would preclude the use of force in relations among states of Asia and the Pacific. In general, the socialist states have worked out a comprehensive program touching on various aspects of security in Asia, have they not, Spartak Ivanovich?

[Beglov] Yes, the region of Asia and the Pacific is possibly most of all in need at present of such a program of action, because in that vast space are concentrated many states and many peoples, and many problems have accumulated which have to be solved, including the problem of detente, elimination of hotbeds of conflict, limitation of the spread of nuclear arms, and stopping the nuclear arms race. In spite of all this, it somehow seems in general that the Asian and Pacific region has so far lacked such a clear and precise reference point.

Well, in recent years, and precisely thanks to the initiatives of the socialist countries, such a program has begun to take shape. First of all, I have in mind the idea put forward by the Soviet Union regarding an integrated approach to the problem of providing for security in Asia. It envisions uniting the efforts of the Asian states and a joint search for ways of strengthening peace in the region. This is not a question of foisting on anyone in Asia some ready-made rigid formula: It is simply a question of getting the representatives of the Asian countries together at last, at various levels. In particular, the Mongolian comrades propose something in the nature of a public forum of representatives of Asia. We ourselves also propose that all this should eventually develop into the creation -- if one may so express it, on the model of the Helsinki process -- of some sort of process of negotiation in which concrete problems could be tackled.

[Kornilov] In other words, what we have in mind is that the Asian countries should jointly participate in drawing up a formula for general Asian security, is that not so, Spartak Ivanovich?

[Beglov] Well, evidently that is just the kind of approach that is needed.

[Sobolev] From the point of view of security in Asia, the state of Soviet-Japanese relations is very important. Unfortunately, a number of aspects of Japan's policy -- its inclusion in the militarist plans of the United States -- are doing nothing to improve the situation in the region. It is all the more important, as the Japanese newspaper SANKEI SHIMBUN has commented, to continue the dialogue, since there is no other way of settling questions on which the positions of our two countries diverge. From this point of view, one ought to emphasize the importance of periodic consultations at the foreign minister level, and, in particular, the visit of Japanese Foreign Minister Abe to the Soviet Union. Altogether, recent days have been rich, as it were, in high-level meetings in Moscow. Let me remind you of the visit to the Soviet Union of Gonzalez, the head of the Spanish Government, the outcome of which has been seen as positive in all respects both in Madrid and in Moscow. Later, there were talks in the Soviet capital with highly placed political figures from Libya and Syria. The Soviet Union's friendly relations with these two countries of the Near East were favorably assessed during the visits and received a new stimulus to development. Much attention, naturally, was given to the problems of the Near East.

[Sobolev] I think we need to mention now that among the important visits to the Soviet capital, of which we were speaking just now, was the arrival of the British parliamentarians. How rich in content their meetings in Moscow were is shown by the fact that they were the first to hear the new Soviet peace proposal addressed to Britain. I remind you that the offer we made was that if Britain officially makes a decision to abolish its nuclear armaments, the Soviet Union would be willing to reduce its nuclear potential to an equivalent extent; and that if Britain were at the same time to remove the foreign nuclear armaments from its territory, the Soviet Union would also guarantee that its nuclear armaments will not be aimed at British territory, and will never be used against Britain.

Implementation of this proposal would change the situation in Europe substantially for the better without detriment to the security of either of the sides. Unfortunately, in a Europe that already has enough arms and problems, the buildup of both continues. The United States intends to increase and diversify, as it were, its arsenals in this European theater of military operations, as they call it; and Western Europe, though in differing degrees, is yielding to the pressure in the name of Atlantic solidarity.

The second half of May was chosen for some of the regular conferences of the leading organs of NATO. At the end of last week the foreign ministers of the countries belonging to this bloc met in Canada, and if one is to believe the U.S. press, Washington confronted them with the task of demonstrating a solidarity that has suffered as a result of the adventurist activities of the U.S. Government in the Middle East and also regarding the arms race.

[Beglov] Vitaliy Sergeyevich, you have said that Western Europe is giving in to U.S. pressure. This is, of course, true overall if one is talking about the behavior of the governments of the leading NATO countries -- I am thinking of those like Great Britain, the FRG to a certain extent, and some others. But if one is to talk about the Western Europe that is represented by the broad public, by ordinary people, then

of course the picture is completely different. The struggle now is taking place around the issue of West European public opinion and the mass parties that represent the working people being able to exert much more influence on the course of events. And this is being felt in the highest echelons of power.

For example, I recently had occasion to visit Greece and this visit coincided exactly with some very dramatic events -- we are all of us now talking about the consequences of the accident at the Chernobyl AES and the way in which Chernobyl has sounded like a bell, drawing people's attention even more to the danger of an atomic war. In the demonstrations and marches and in the antiwar meetings that have been taking place in Greece over the past few days, the call for the spread of nuclear weapons and chemical weapons across Europe to be halted has been heard with increasing force.

Against this background I think that we can say that the implementation of the NATO plans which the United States is still trying to lay down in the old way and to impose -- I think that we can say it is now getting increasingly difficult to implement this line. Look at what happened this week on the question of strategic armaments. The United States announced on the one hand that in connection with the forthcoming launching of the "Nevada" submarine and the fact that the United States will obtain 24 new submarine-based carriers, they will scrap 2 submarines of the Poseidon system. But President Reagan immediately considered it necessary to say that this was being done more for economic reasons. Why was that statement made? Because the President was unable to admit that the main thing behind this action was, in fact, pressure from the public, both in the United States itself and in Western Europe. And immediately, of course, both the Pentagon leaders and Defense Secretary Weinberger, and the President himself, started to threaten that the SALT II treaty is allegedly doomed in any case, to threaten that they will take certain steps by the end of the year which will lead to the violation of the limits that have been set by the treaty, in particular regarding the equipping of bombers with cruise missiles and so on. But the situation is such that when the NATO foreign ministers assembled at the end of the week for their session in Halifax, Canada, it turned out that Washington's position and the attack on the SALT II treaty did not essentially receive support.

[Sobolev] Such steps which are openly aimed at a world arms race and the militarization of open space and at whipping up international tension clearly give rise to concern among U.S. allies and this is indicated by the official statements.

The statement by the Soviet Government concerning Washington's decision not to observe in future the limitations imposed by the SALT II treaty was on the whole, therefore, received with understanding, even among Western observers who are very sympathetic to the United States. This decision makes even more obvious the reason why the United States has such an unconstructive stance at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space weapons, and also on the issue of what a new Soviet-U.S. summit meeting should be like. All people on earth, no matter what their convictions, believe that this meeting will bring concrete results in the field of security. American willingness and the appropriate political atmosphere are essential for this. The decision of the U.S. Administration cuts across these two conditions.

Judging by the first reactions in the press, people abroad have paid the most serious attention to the words of the Soviet statement about the fact that our country will take the necessary practical measures to prevent military and strategic parity from being undermined. This, as is noted by our colleagues on progressive newspapers, is important

not only to ensure the security of the socialist community but to strengthen international security as a whole, too. However, such a development of events is not the choice of the Soviet Union. And it is worth repeating that practically all of its allies have expressed concern in one form or another in connection with Washington's decision.

[Beglov] Approximately the same thing took place in connection with the refusal of the United States to join in the unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions: Because West Europeans, including representatives of governments, are extremely wary. I would even say that they have expressed in an extremely frank way their displeasure at the provocative position of the United States with regard to the problem of a nuclear test ban. In Britain, in particular eminent people have been writing -- I am quoting from the NEW STATESMAN -- that scientists have proved that not one of the arguments given by the U.S. Governemnt in its attempts to frustrate the ban on all nuclear tests has any foundation. As a result, the journal writes, the United States is threatened with finding itself in isolation at the UN disarmament conference that will shortly resume its session and where the question of a treaty on a complete ban on all nuclear tests will again be raised. So, on this question too, it is not so easy for the Americans to impose their will. But...

[Kornilov interrupting] Even the fact that -- I would like to recall this, too, to back up what you have been saying, Spartak Ivanovich -- well, the spring session of the North Atlantic assembly ended in Luxembourg a few days ago. The North Atlantic assembly is a kind of...

[Sobolev interrupting] It is NATO's parliament.

[Kornilov] Yes, yes, and its chairman, Mathias, a U.S. senator, called upon parliamentarians of the 16 NATO member-countries to get the United States to follow the example of the Soviet Union and end nuclear tests, and to get Washington to continue to uphold the existing Soviet-American agreements on arms control. It is quite noteworthy and quite characteristic that even in the NATO parliament, as you call it, even there, calls of this kind resound in full voice.

[Beglov] At the same time we have grounds for saying that the struggle for the program of radical disarmament measures put forward by the Soviet Union and for all the practical actions that are now on the disarmament agenda affecting all types of weapons, this struggle is of course building up.

But it is acquiring an increasingly complicated character, so that on the one hand there are, of course, no grounds for saying that path is wide open for the implementation of these proposals and these initiatives, that all one has to do is stretch out one's hand and agreements are already within reach. But neither must one rush to the other extreme, that is to say, proceed from the position that the United States has succeeded in its desire to block the Soviet proposals. No, this is not what has happened.

If one is to talk about the actual state of affairs, then the policy of the U.S. Administration is essentially now finding itself increasingly in a state of isolation. And this applies even to the latest episode, the one involving chemical weapons, because after the Pentagon had literally stolen agreement from the West Europeans at the end of last week -- I have not been able to find another word to describe it -- they used a procedural trick in order to secure the agreement -- they stole the agreement, the sanction, for the production of binary weapons because this was a requirement of the U.S. Congress. Three times the U.S. Congress rejected attempts by the Pentagon to

obtain allocations for binary weapons and it only agreed to do this on condition that the agreement of the West Europeans was secured for the deployment of these weapons. And so what happened? This agreement was formally given, on the grounds that once the Americans have pointed out the guidelines and the purposes of their plan, then that is sufficient for considering it sanctioned by NATO. But, in fact, as soon as this session had finished, the session of the Defense Planning Committee, one after another the defense ministers who took part in this session from countries like the Netherlands, Denmark, Luxembourg, Norway, and Greece -- and others joined in with them -- said that if there had been a vote, a formal vote, and if there had been a precise procedure for explaining attitudes toward the U.S. plan, then they would have rejected this plan for the deployment of chemical weapons.

[Sobolev] It turns out that only the FRG, Britain, and Turkey are firm supporters of these U.S. plans for binary weapons. The defense ministers of six countries, while they did not object to the production of binary weapons in connection with the situation that you have described, have refused to have them sited on their own territory, whether in the event of crises or in the event of war.

[Kornilob] Be that as it may, NATO's military organs, and the Military Planning Committee at defense minister level in particular, have adopted, under pressure from the United States, under strong pressure, while having their arms twisted -- yes, that is all true -- but they have adopted a decision which sanctions the start of the production of a new generation of chemical weapons -- binary weapons -- in the United States. And NATO's action thereby raises in all its sharpness the question of whether or not there is to be chemical disarmament.

As far as our country's position on this very important problem is concerned, it was set out with extreme precision in the Soviet Government statement published a few days ago, which says: For the Soviet Union, the answer to this question has always been and remains unequivocal. Chemical weapons, which are a fanatical means of mass extermination are to be fully banned and unconditionally destroyed. And the only path to the attainment of this goal lies through political decisions and through verifiable international accords.

[Sobolev] I would again like to draw our listeners' attention to the fact that the initiative for the production of chemical weapons belongs to the Americans, and Washington is increasingly offhand in sweeping aside the views of its NATO allies.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1414

BRIEFS

SOVIET-BULGARIAN CONSULTATIONS--Soviet-Bulgarian consultations on questions of disarmament were held at the Bulgarian Foreign Ministry 26-28 May. Participating in them on the Soviet side was V.L. Israelyan, member of the USSR Foreign Ministry Collegium, and , on the Bulgarian side, K. Tellalov, head of the Bulgarian delegation at the disarmament conference. The participants in the consultations had talks with P. Mladenov, member of the BCP Central Committee Politburo and Bulgarian foreign minister. [TASS report: "Soviet-Bulgarian Consultations"] [Text] [Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 May 86 Morning Edition p 5 PM] /9738

ARCHITECTS AGAINST NUCLEAR WAR--Moscow, 20 May (TASS)--Soviet and U.S. architects called on organizations of architects, designers and planners all over the world to draw more actively into the struggle for liquidating nuclear and chemical weapons and for stopping the arms race. At today's press conference in Moscow they have made public a joint appeal adopted as a result of the visit to the USSR by a delegation of the American organization architects, designers, planners for social responsibility headed by its president Tician Papachristou. A decision was taken during the delegation's visit on setting up the new movement international architects, designers, planners for the prevention of nuclear war. The historic role of architects is to create and preserve the environment for the life and activities of people. Nuclear weapons which can trigger off a nuclear war, is a threat to our cities, dwellings and social life, underlines the appeal. We regard it as our duty to elucidate to our colleagues, the public and political quarters and need for removing the nuclear threat, stopping the arms race and for preventing its shift to space. The appeal emphasizes that architects can and must make a contribution to a noble cause of achieving peace all over the world. Soviet and American architects pointed out that huge funds spent in the world for arms must be used for the good of people and not for the creation of more powerful and dangerous means of destruction. We return to our homeland with confidence that we have reached mutual understanding on the danger facing mankind, Tician Papachristou told the press conference. He acclaimed the Soviet Government's decision to extend the unilateral moratorium on all nuclear tests. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1736 GMT 20 May 86 LD] /9738

CSO: 5200/1414

END